WALLS AND ASYMPTOTICS FOR BRIDGELAND STABILITY CONDITIONS ON 3-FOLDS
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Abstract. We consider Bridgeland stability conditions for three-folds conjectured by Bayer–Macrì–Toda in the case of Picard rank one. We study the differential geometry of numerical walls, characterizing when they are bounded, discussing possible intersections, and showing that they are essentially regular. Next, we prove that walls within a certain region of the upper half plane that parametrizes geometric stability conditions must always intersect the curve given by the vanishing of the slope function and, for a fixed value of $s$, have a maximum turning point there. We then use these facts to prove that Gieseker semistability is equivalent to a strong form of asymptotic semistability along a class of paths in the upper half plane, and show how to find large families of walls. We illustrate how to compute all of the walls and describe the Bridgeland moduli spaces for the Chern character $(2, 0, -1, 0)$ on complex projective 3-space in a suitable region of the upper half plane.

1. Introduction

Bridgeland’s notion of stability conditions on triangulated categories, introduced in [9] and [10], provides a new set of tools to study moduli spaces of sheaves on smooth projective varieties. Such tools have been successfully applied by many authors first to the study of sheaves on surfaces, for example, [1, 2, 4, 5, 13, 14, 15, 21, 39], and more recently on three-folds (especially $\mathbb{P}^3$), see for instance [16, 25, 34, 36]. One way to study moduli spaces of sheaves using Bridgeland stability spaces is to restrict attention to the so called geometric stability conditions parametrized by (a subset of) the upper half plane $\mathbb{H}$. Once we know that the moduli space of Bridgeland stable objects is asymptotically given by the Gieseker semistable moduli space along an unbounded path we can try to locate all the points where the moduli space changes along this path (these isolated points are called walls) and compute the change to the moduli space. Eventually, we might reach a point where the Bridgeland space is empty and then we can reverse our steps to reconstruct the Gieseker moduli space.

For surfaces, this is a fairly well understood process. In that case, it is known that the geometric stability space is non-empty, that there only finitely many walls in $\mathbb{H}$ which are nested semi-circles centered along the horizontal axis, and that Bridgeland stability is asymptotic to (twisted) Gieseker stability. Furthermore, there is an effective algorithm to find all such walls for a given Chern character, and then we can carry out the process above to recover the moduli space of semistable sheaves. One approach to finding walls in this case is to observe that every wall for a given Chern character $v$ intersects a special curve which we will denote $\Theta_v$ in this paper, given by the vanishing locus of the slope function $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}(v)$, and we can then restrict attention to finding walls along $\Theta_v$. 


The whole process becomes much more complicated for three-folds. We can still use the two dimensional construction, but it does not produce full stability conditions and it is unable to detect sufficient features of the Gieseker moduli spaces, since the latter does not coincide, in general, with the asymptotic moduli space.

The first step to improve this was made possible by a number of results guaranteeing the existence of Bridgeland stability conditions on the derived category of sheaves on different types of three-folds, based on the pioneering work of Bayer, Macrì and Toda \cite{7}. Their idea is to start with the surface case and tilt again. This provides a full stability condition, and the family of moduli spaces is considerably more refined than the one provided by the first tilt. Even though there is no general result which shows that their construction works for all smooth three-folds, it is known to work for a wide variety of relevant examples: \( \mathbb{P}^3 \) \cite{23}, smooth quadric three-folds \cite{23} \cite{33}, Fano three-folds with Picard rank one \cite{18}, more general Fano 3-folds \cite{8} \cite{30} and smooth quintic three-folds \cite{19}. More precisely, the geometric stability conditions constructed by Bayer, Macrì and Toda via the generalized Bogomolov–Gieseker inequality proposed in \cite{7} depends on three real parameters \((\alpha, \beta, s) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^+\). For each of these we have an abelian category \( A_{\alpha, \beta} \) and a slope function \( \lambda_{\alpha, \beta, s} \) which allows us to test the stability of objects of \( A_{\alpha, \beta} \). There are, however, known counterexamples (see \cite{35} and \cite{26}) where the generalized Bogomolov inequality fails.

The goal of this paper is to advance on the other two stages of the process outlined above, namely the understanding of the structure of walls, and of asymptotic stability. We only consider the case where \( X \) is a smooth projective three-fold of Picard rank 1 over an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero. This means that we can view our Chern classes (and their twists) as purely numerical vectors of the form \( v = (v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3) \).

In order to study walls, we start by providing a uniform way to define the slope functions and their differences in terms of skew-symmetric functions. We go on to consider a number of general properties of numerical \( \lambda \)-walls (defined as the locus where two \( \lambda \)-slopes are equal) in Section 4.1. They are, in general, quartic curves, possibly unbounded and not connected.

In our first main result, We find a simple characterization of those numerical \( \lambda \)-walls which are bounded, and show that unbounded walls satisfy a version of Bertram’s Nested Wall Theorem. Given numerical Chern characters \( v, u \) and \( u' \), we define \( \delta_{01}(u, v) := u_0v_1 - u_1v_0 \), and an equivalence relation \( u \sim_v u' \) which is essentially that the \( \lambda \)-walls for \( v \) corresponding to \( u \) and \( u' \) are the same, see \cite{31} for a precise definition. We also remark that when \( v \) is a numerical Chern character satisfying the Bogomolov inequality \( v_1^2 - 2v_0v_2 \geq 0 \) and \( v_0 \neq 0 \), the curve \( \Theta_v \) allows us to divide the upper half plane \( \mathbb{H} \) into four regions (see Figure 1 for an example and Section 3 for details).

Main Theorem 1. Suppose \( v_0 \neq 0 \) and \( u \not\sim_v u' \).

(1) The numerical \( \lambda \)-wall for \( v \) corresponding to \( u \) is bounded if and only if \( \delta_{01}(u, v) \neq 0 \).

(2) If \( \delta_{01}(u, v) = 0 = \delta_{01}(u', v) \) then the numerical \( \lambda \)-walls corresponding to \( u \) and \( u' \) do not intersect.

(3) If \( \delta_{01}(u, v) \neq 0 \) and \( \text{ch}_{\leq 2}(u) = \text{ch}_{\leq 2}(u') \), then the numerical \( \lambda \)-walls for \( v \) corresponding to \( u \) and \( u' \) only intersect on \( \Theta_v \).
(4) An unbounded numerical \( \lambda \)-wall for \( v \) does not intersect \( \Theta_v \), and its unbounded connected components are contained in \( R^+_v \).

The different parts of Main Theorem 1 are proved in various results contained in Section 4.

Figure 1. The four regions of the plane as defined by the hyperbola \( \Theta_v \) and the vertical line \( \{ \beta = \mu(v) \} \) when \( v \) is a numerical Chern character satisfying the Bogomolov inequality \( v_1^2 - 2v_0v_2 \geq 0 \) and \( v_0 \neq 0 \). In this picture, we used \( \text{ch} \leq 2(v) = (2, -1, -5/2) \).

The third stage, determining the asymptotics, is not well known. In [7, Section 6], it is shown that the large volume limit as \( \alpha \to \infty \) for \( (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{H} \) gives a polynomial stability condition, but other directions were not considered. However, unlike the two-dimensional case, we cannot assume that the walls are bounded in all directions. In fact, it is easy to check that, as \( s \to 0 \), the walls are unbounded and it is theoretically possible that the number of walls is infinite.

This means that the large volume limit is more subtle than for surfaces. We need, therefore, to be more careful about what we mean by asymptotic stability, which we define precisely in Definition 7.1. We use a strong form of such asymptotic stability which effectively includes finiteness of the number of walls for a given object. We also need to be careful to specify the curve along which we are considering the asymptotics. To this end we introduce the notion of unbounded \( \Theta^\pm \) curve which is essentially a curve which is asymptotically either to the left or to the right of all \( \Theta \) curves, see Definition 5.9.

To help set this up, we also consider what would happen for surfaces in Section 5. In our case, we look at so called \( \nu \)-stability for three-folds, which mimics stability for surfaces given by the first tilt on the category of coherent sheaves, by reproving results about the large volume limit without the assumption that the walls are bounded.

In order to describe the asymptotics, we need to understand how the stability of an object varies along curves. For \( \nu \)-stability, it turns out that objects can only be destabilized once along outward moving curves (which cross \( \nu \)-walls only once).
This is not true for $\lambda$-stability, but we can pick a destabilizing object far enough along the curve which is guaranteed to remain so to infinity. Accomplishing such task requires an understanding of the geometry of $\lambda$-walls. For the $\nu$-walls, this was simple because they were circles and the key property is that they cross the $\Theta_v$ curve at their maximum. To understand the similar properties of $\lambda$-walls we need to understand their differential properties in a similar way. We do this is Section 6.

It turns out to be easier to study the differential properties of the two dimensional wall which we call $\Sigma_{u,v}$ regarded as a real algebraic quartic surface in $\mathbb{R}^3$. We show that $\Sigma_{u,v}$ is regular except at some exceptional points and for exceptional $u$ and $v$ (see Theorem 6.6 for the details).

Moreover, there is again a special curve, here denoted $\Gamma_{v,s}$, which is defined as the vanishing locus of the slope function $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}(v)$. When $s = 1/3$, a numerical $\lambda$-wall for $v$ crosses $\Gamma_{v,1/3}$ at is maximum point (just as a $\nu$-wall crosses $\Theta_v$ at its maximum), and the associated $\nu$-wall at its minimum point. This imposes large constraints on the possible numerical $\lambda$-walls when $s = 1/3$. We also show that for $s \geq 1/3$ any wall existing for one value of $s$ must also exist for all $s$. When $s < 1/3$ we show that any wall existing for $s$ exists for all value less than that value of $s$.

The key conclusion is the following, see also Theorem 6.16; the proof uses key differential geometric information about $\Sigma_{u,v}$ such as its Gauss and mean curvatures.

**Main Theorem 2.** Suppose a real numerical Chern character $v$ satisfies the Bogomolov inequality and $v_0 \neq 0$. Any connected bounded component of a numerical $\lambda$-wall in $R_{-}^{-v,s}$ for some $s \geq 1/3$ intersects $\Gamma_{v,s}$.

Although the same statement is not true of unbounded walls, we can describe the explicit conditions $u$ must satisfy so that the wall corresponding to $u$ intersects $\Gamma_{v,s}$.

We are then finally in position to prove in Section 7 that strong asymptotic stability is equivalent to Gieseker stability. Our results can be summarized as follows.

**Main Theorem 3.** Let $v$ be a numerical Chern character with $v_0 \neq 0$ and satisfying the Bogomolov inequality; fix $s \geq 1/3$.

1. If $\gamma$ be an unbounded $\Theta^-$-curve, then an object $E \in D^b(X)$ is asymptotically $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-(semi)stable along $\gamma$ if and only if $E$ is Gieseker (semi)stable sheaf.
2. If $\gamma$ be an unbounded $\Theta^+$-curve, then an object $E \in D^b(X)$ is asymptotically $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-(semi)stable along $\gamma$ if and only if $E^\vee$ is Gieseker (semi)stable sheaf.

Duals of Gieseker semistable sheaves can be described via a technical lemma of independent interest which characterizes duals of torsion free sheaves on 3-folds (see Proposition 2.15 for the details). We also emphasize that more is true for the special curve $\Gamma_{v,s}$, which is an example of an unbounded $\Theta^-$-curve: the first part of the previous statement holds for every $s > 0$.

The study of the differential geometry of $\lambda$-walls is also useful to help locate them. Here again there is a complication. For $\nu$-walls (or walls for surfaces), a point on an actual $\nu$-wall corresponds to an actual destabilizing sub-object $F$ of an object $E$ which is $\nu$-stable on one side of the wall and $\nu$-unstable on the other. This is then always the case at all points along the numerical $\nu$-wall. In other words, if a portion of a numerical $\nu$-wall is an actual $\nu$-wall then the whole $\nu$-wall is an actual $\nu$-wall. It follows that to locate actual $\nu$-walls it suffices to look along, say, a
vertical line from the limiting centre or along \( \Theta_v \); we do this in two examples, one in \( 8.1 \) and the other in Lemma \( 8.6 \).

The situation for \( \lambda \)-walls is quite different. While we have proved that numerical \( \lambda \)-walls to the left of \( \Theta_v \) must intersect \( \Gamma_{v,s} \), that need not be true of actual \( \lambda \)-walls. However, the largest actual \( \lambda \)-wall (if it exists) must cross \( \Gamma_{v,s} \), and this allows us to find \( \lambda \)-walls by working along \( \Gamma_{v,s} \) from infinity.

We work out a complete example for the case of the Chern character \( v = (2, 0, -1, 0) \) on \( \mathbb{P}^3 \). This is done for the region to the left of \( \Theta_v \) in Proposition 8.11. The key step is to first find what we call pseudo-walls. These are given by destabilizing objects which satisfy the Bogomolov and generalized Bogomolov inequalities. This approach to finding \( \lambda \)-walls complements the method of Schmidt’s \([34, \text{Theorem 6.1}]\) which is to observe that, essentially, the \( \lambda \)-walls crossing \( \Theta_v \) must also cross their associated \( \nu \)-wall at the same point.

We close the paper with a number of examples for the case of \( \mathbb{P}^3 \) in Section 8. First we consider the case of the ideal sheaf of a line; it illustrates one of two typical situations in which the \( \Gamma_{v,s} \) curve intersects \( \Theta_v \). In this case, we show that there must exist a vanishing \( \lambda \)-wall containing the intersection point (see Theorem 4.22) and we illustrate this by constructing the wall for this example. We also consider the ideal sheaf of a point for which \( \Gamma_{v,s} \) and \( \Theta_v \) do not cross and provides some additional stability information for our final example which is the null correlation sheaves on \( \mathbb{P}^3 \). In this case, we show there are no \( \nu \)-walls. This allows us to use a helpful additional numerical condition for the walls given in Lemma 8.10 which arises from a general result Proposition 4.3 which gives a simple numerical condition for when a \( \lambda \)-wall intersects a \( \nu \)-wall. These cases are also considered from a different point of view using Bridgeland stability in \([37]\). We can then describe the Bridgeland moduli spaces \( M_i \) which occur to the left of \( \Theta_v \) as follows.

**Main Theorem 4.** Let \( Z \) denote the moduli space of Gieseker semistable sheaves \( K \) of Chern character \( (2, 0, -2, 2) \) and \( G \) the Grassmanian of lines \( L \) in \( \mathbb{P}^3 \), and fix \( s = 1/3 \). Let \( v = (2, 0, -1, 0) \) be the numerical Chern character corresponding to null correlation sheaves on \( \mathbb{P}^3 \). The region \( R_v^- \) is divided into three stability chambers whose associated Bridgeland moduli spaces are described as follows:

1. \( M_1 \cong \mathbb{P}^5 \), and the stable objects are null correlation sheaves;
2. \( M_2 \cong \{ (K, L) \in Z \times G \mid \text{Ext}^1(K, O_L(-1)) \neq 0 \} \), which is an irreducible projective variety of dimension 16, and the stable objects are extensions of \( K \) by \( O_L(-1) \);
3. \( M_3 = \emptyset \).
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2. Background material and notation

Let $X$ be an irreducible, non-singular projective variety over an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero of dimension three with $\text{Pic}(X) = \mathbb{Z}$. Fix an ample generator $L$ of $\text{Pic}(X)$. Our assumptions mean that each object $A \in D^b(X)$ has a well defined numerical Chern character

$$\text{ch}(A) := (\text{ch}(0)(A), \text{ch}(1)(A) \cdot L^2, \text{ch}(2)(A) \cdot L, \text{ch}(3)(A)) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} \times \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z} \times \frac{1}{6}\mathbb{Z}.$$

Abusing notation we will simply write $\text{ch}(A)$ for $\text{ch}(i)(A) \cdot L^{3-i}$. We will refer to an element of $\mathbb{R}^4 = \mathbb{R} \otimes K_{\text{num}}(X)$ as a real numerical Chern Character and an element $\nu$ of $\mathbb{Z} \times \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z} \times \frac{1}{6}\mathbb{Z}$ as a Chern character when there is an object $A \in D^b(X)$ such that $\nu = \text{ch}(A)$. We write the components as $\nu = (v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3)$ corresponding to the Chern characters of objects so that the underlying real Chern character $\nu$ which is the numerical Chern character $\text{ch}(A)$ of an object of $D^b(X)$ satisfies $v_i = \text{ch}(i)(A)$.

Given $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, recall the definition of the twisted Chern character $\text{ch}^\beta(A) := \exp(-\beta L) \cdot \text{ch}(A) = (\text{ch}^\beta_0(A), \text{ch}^\beta_1(A), \text{ch}^\beta_2(A), \text{ch}^\beta_3(A))$. So

$$\text{ch}^\beta_0(A) := \text{ch}(0)(A);$$
$$\text{ch}^\beta_1(A) := \text{ch}(1)(A) - \beta \text{ch}(0)(A);$$
$$\text{ch}^\beta_2(A) := \text{ch}(2)(A) - \beta \text{ch}(1)(A) + \frac{1}{2}\beta^2 \text{ch}(0)(A);$$
$$\text{ch}^\beta_3(A) := \text{ch}(3)(A) - \beta \text{ch}(2)(A) + \frac{1}{2}\beta^2 \text{ch}(1)(A) - \frac{1}{6}\beta^3 \text{ch}(0)(A).$$

Recall that the $\mu$-slope of a coherent sheaf $E \in \text{Coh}(X)$ is defined as follows:

$$\mu(E) := \begin{cases} 
\text{ch}_1(E)/\text{ch}_0(E) & \text{if } E \text{ is torsion free}, \\
+\infty & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases}$$

In addition, we also define

$$\mu^+(E) := \max\{\mu(F) \mid \text{every non-zero subsheaf } F \hookrightarrow E\} \quad \text{and}$$
$$\mu^-(E) := \min\{\mu(G) \mid \text{every non-zero quotient } E \twoheadrightarrow G\}.$$

As usual, a $E$ is said to be $\mu$-(semi)stable if every subsheaf $F \hookrightarrow E$ satisfies $\mu(F) < (\leq) \mu(E)$. So that $E$ is $\mu$-semistable if and only if $\mu^+(E) = \mu(E)$, or equivalently $\mu^-(E) = \mu(E)$.

2.1. $\nu$-stability. Given $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, consider the following torsion pair on $\text{Coh}(X)$

$$T_\beta := \{E \in \text{Coh}(X) \mid \text{every non-zero quotient } E \twoheadrightarrow G \text{ satisfies } \mu(G) > \beta\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{F}_\beta := \{E \in \text{Coh}(X) \mid \text{every non-zero subsheaf } F \hookrightarrow E \text{ satisfies } \mu(F) \leq \beta\}.$$

Tilting on $(\mathcal{F}_\beta, T_\beta)$, one obtains an abelian subcategory $\mathcal{B}^\beta(X) := (\mathcal{F}_\beta[1], T_\beta)$ of $D^b(X)$, which is the heart of a t-structure on $D^b(X)$.

For $B \in D^b(X)$, let $\mathcal{H}^p(B)$ denote cohomology with respect to $\text{Coh}(X)$. Observe that the objects of $\mathcal{B}^\beta(X)$ are those $B \in D^b(X)$ such that:

- $\mathcal{H}^p(B) = 0$ for $p \neq -1, 0$,
- $\mathcal{H}^{-1}(B) \in \mathcal{F}_\beta$, and
- $\mathcal{H}^0(B) \in T_\beta$. 

In particular, from the definition of $\mathcal{F}_B, \mathcal{H}^{-1}(B)$ must be a torsion free sheaf.

Introducing a new parameter $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+$, one considers a group homomorphism

$$Z_{\alpha, \beta}^{\text{tilt}} : K_{\text{num}}(X) \to \mathbb{C},$$

called a **central charge**, given by

$$Z_{\alpha, \beta}^{\text{tilt}}(B) := - \left( \frac{1}{2} \alpha^2 \text{ch}_0(B) + \sqrt{-1} \text{ch}_1^0(B) \right), \quad \text{for } B \in \mathcal{B}^3(X),$$

whose corresponding slope function is

$$\nu_{\alpha, \beta}(B) := \begin{cases} \frac{\text{ch}_2^\beta(B) - \alpha^2 \text{ch}_0(B)}{\text{ch}_1^\beta(B)}, & \text{if } \text{ch}_1^\beta(B) \neq 0, \\ +\infty, & \text{if } \text{ch}_1^\beta(B) = 0. \end{cases}$$

In addition, we also define

$$\nu_{\alpha, \beta}^+(B) := \max\{\nu_{\alpha, \beta}(F) \mid F \hookrightarrow B \text{ in } \mathcal{B}^3, \ F \neq 0\} \quad \text{and}$$

$$\nu_{\alpha, \beta}^-(B) := \min\{\nu_{\alpha, \beta}(G) \mid B \hookrightarrow G \text{ in } \mathcal{B}^3, \ G \neq 0\}.$$

An object $B \in D^b(X)$ is said to be $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}$-(semi)stable if $B \in \mathcal{B}^3(X)$ and every sub-object $F \hookrightarrow B$ within $\mathcal{B}^3(X)$ satisfies $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}(F) < (\leq) \nu_{\alpha, \beta}(B)$. Note that $E$ is $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}$-semistable if and only if $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}^+(E) = \nu_{\alpha, \beta}(E)$, equivalently, $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}^-(E) = \nu_{\alpha, \beta}(E)$.

Every $\mu$-semistable sheaf and every $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}$-semistable object $B \in \mathcal{B}^3(X)$ satisfies the usual Bogomolov inequality, which in our situation is purely numerical, see [7 Corollary 7.3.2]:

$$Q_{\alpha, \beta}(B) := \text{ch}_1(B)^2 - 2\text{ch}_0(B)\text{ch}_2(B) \geq 0.$$ 

In addition, for certain choices of $X$, every $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}$-semistable object $B \in \mathcal{B}^3(X)$ also satisfies the following **generalized Bogomolov inequality**

$$Q_{\alpha, \beta}(B) = \alpha^2 Q_{\alpha, \beta}^{\text{tilt}}(B) + 4(\text{ch}_2^\beta(B))^2 - 6\text{ch}_1^\beta(B)\text{ch}_3^\beta(B)$$

$$= Q_{\alpha, \beta}^{\text{tilt}}(B)(\alpha^2 + \beta^2) + (6\text{ch}_0(B)\text{ch}_1(B) - 2\text{ch}_1(B)\text{ch}_2(B))\beta$$

$$+ 4\text{ch}_2(B)^2 - 6\text{ch}_1(B)\text{ch}_3(B) \geq 0,$$

originally proposed in [7 Conjecture 1.3.1]. This inequality was proved to hold for all Fano and abelian threefolds with Picard rank 1, see [18] and [6, 22], respectively, and for the quintic 3-fold [19]. We assume from now on that $X$ is such that the generalized Bogomolov inequality [1] holds for all $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}$-semistable objects.

Let $\mathbb{H} := \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}$, thought as the upper half plane, with coordinates denoted by $(\alpha, \beta)$. We will want to consider the slope function as a function of $\alpha$ and $\beta$ and to this end it is convenient to define the following function on $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{H}:

$$\rho_v(\alpha, \beta) = v_2 - v_1 \beta + v_0(\beta^2 - \alpha^2)/2,$$

which coincides with the numerator of $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}(B)$ when $v = \text{ch}(B)$. To simplify the notation, we define $\rho_B(\alpha, \beta) := \rho_v(\beta)(\alpha, \beta)$ for objects $B \in D^b(X)$.

Note that the pair $(\mathcal{B}^3(X), Z_{\alpha, \beta}^{\text{tilt}})$ is a **weak stability condition** in $D^b(X)$, in the sense of [8 Section 2], for all pairs $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}$. In practical terms, this gives:

**Proposition 2.1.** Fix $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$. If $B \in \mathcal{B}^3$, then $\text{ch}_1^\beta(B) \geq 0$, with equality only if $\rho_B(\alpha, \beta) \geq 0$ for all $\alpha > 0$. 

2.2. λ-stability. The next step is to consider the following torsion pair on $\mathcal{B}^b(X)$
$\mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\beta} := \{ E \in \mathcal{B}^b(X) \mid \text{every non-zero quotient } E \to G \text{ satisfies } \nu_{\alpha,\beta}(G) > 0 \}$, and
$\mathcal{F}_{\alpha,\beta} := \{ E \in \mathcal{B}^b(X) \mid \text{every non-zero sub-object } F \hookrightarrow E \text{ satisfies } \nu_{\alpha,\beta}(F) \leq 0 \}.$
Tilting on $(\mathcal{F}_{\alpha,\beta}, \mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\beta})$, one obtains a new abelian subcategory $\mathcal{A}^{\alpha,\beta}(X) := \langle \mathcal{F}_{\alpha,\beta}[1], \mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\beta} \rangle$ of $D^b(X)$, which is also the heart of a t-structure on $D^b(X)$.
One then introduces a third parameter $s > 0$ in order to define a family of central charges
$$Z_{\alpha,\beta,s} : K_{\text{num}}(X) \to \mathbb{C}$$
as follows, for $A \in \mathcal{A}^{\alpha,\beta}(X)$:

(6) $Z_{\alpha,\beta,s}(A) := -\text{ch}^2_3(A) + (s + 1/6)\alpha^2 \text{ch}^1_2(A) + \sqrt{-1} \left( \text{ch}^2_2(A) - \alpha^2 \text{ch}^0_0(A)/2 \right)$,
whose corresponding slope function is

(7) $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}(A) := \begin{cases} \frac{\text{ch}^2_2(A) - (s + 1/6)\alpha^2 \text{ch}^1_2(A)}{\text{ch}^2_2(A) - \alpha^2 \text{ch}^0_0(A)/2}, & \text{if } \text{ch}^2_2(A) - \alpha^2 \text{ch}^0_0(A)/2 \neq 0, \\ +\infty, & \text{if } \text{ch}^2_2(A) - \alpha^2 \text{ch}^0_0(A)/2 = 0. \end{cases}$

Remark 2.2. We could also consider a more general central charge, whose real part is

$$-\text{ch}^2_3(A) + b \text{ch}^2_2(A) + a \text{ch}^1_1(A)$$
for parameters $b \in \mathbb{R}$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}^+$, see [6] Lemma 8.3 and [30]. However, we will only consider the special case where $b = 0$, while $a = \alpha^2(s + 1/6)$.

An object $A \in D^b(X)$ is said to be $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-(semi)stable if $A \in \mathcal{A}^{\alpha,\beta}(X)$ and every sub-object $F \hookrightarrow A$ within $\mathcal{A}^{\alpha,\beta}(X)$ satisfies $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}(F) < (\leq) \lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}(B)$.

For further reference, we define for each real numerical Chern character $v \in \mathbb{R}^4$, the following the function on $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{H}$:

(8) $\tau_{v,s}(\alpha, \beta) = v_3 - v_2\beta + \frac{1}{2}v_1\beta^2 - \frac{1}{6}v_0\beta^3 - \left( s + \frac{1}{6} \right)(v_1 - v_0\beta)a^2$,
which coincides with the numerator of $\lambda_{(\alpha, \beta, s)}(A)$ when $v = \text{ch}(A)$. Again, we define $\tau_{A,s}(\alpha, \beta) := \tau_{\text{ch}(A),s}(\alpha, \beta)$ for objects $A \in D^b(X)$, and we will also write $\tau_{v,s}(\alpha, \beta) = \tau_{v,s}(\alpha, \beta)$. Note that, when non-zero, the denominator of $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}(A)$ is $\rho_A(\alpha, \beta)$.

Finally, a direct consequence of the generalised Bogomolov inequality [4] is that $(\mathcal{A}^{\alpha,\beta}(X), Z_{\alpha,\beta,s})$ is a (numerical) stability condition, in the sense of [7] Definition 2.1.1, for every triple $(\alpha, \beta, s) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^+$. In practical terms, this yields:

Proposition 2.3. Fix $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{H}$. If $A \in \mathcal{A}^{\alpha,\beta}(X)$ is non-zero, then $\rho_A(\alpha, \beta) \geq 0$, with equality only if $\tau_{A,s}(\alpha, \beta) > 0$ for every $s \in \mathbb{R}^+$.

The generalised Bogomolov inequality can also be used to prove a form of the support property for $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-semistability. In the case we are considering where the Picard rank is 1 we can state it as follows:

Proposition 2.4. [6] Thm. 8.7 Suppose $X$ is a smooth 3-fold with Picard rank 1 such that the generalised Bogomolov inequality [4] holds for all $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}$-semistable objects. If $E \in \mathcal{A}^{\alpha,\beta}$ is $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-semistable then $Q_{\alpha,\beta}(E) \geq 0$. 

Remark 2.5. This implies that \((A^{\alpha,\beta}(X), Z_{\alpha,\beta,s})\) is a (full) Bridgeland stability condition on \(D^b(X)\).

Remark 2.6. Observe that \(\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}\)-semistable objects may not satisfy the usual Bogomolov inequality: \(A := \mathcal{O}_X[2] \oplus \mathcal{O}_X(1)\) is \(\lambda_{1/2,1/2,s}\)-semistable for every \(s > 0\), but \(Q^{\text{shift}}(A) = -1\).

When we come to do more detailed computations, it will also be useful to have a more uniform notation for the various functions of \(v \in K_{\text{num}}(X)\) introduced above; more precisely, we define the following

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ch}_0^{\alpha,\beta}(v) := v_0, & \quad \text{ch}_2^{\alpha,\beta}(v) := \rho_e(\alpha, \beta), \\
\text{ch}_1^{\alpha,\beta}(v) := \text{ch}_1^{\beta}(v), & \quad \text{ch}_3^{\alpha,\beta}(v) := \tau_{e,1/3}(\alpha, \beta).
\end{align*}
\]

We also define \(\Delta^{\alpha,\beta}(v) = 0\) for \(i \not\in \{0,1,2,3\}\). Alternatively, one can also define

\[\text{ch}^{\alpha,\beta}(v) = \text{Re}(\exp(-\beta - \sqrt{-1}\alpha) \cdot v).\]

The reason for setting \(s = 1/3\) will become clearer in Section 4.2, but one technical reason is that the partial derivatives of \(\text{ch}_i^{\alpha,\beta}(v)\) with respect to \(\alpha\) and \(\beta\) behave very well; more precisely:

\[
\partial_\alpha \text{ch}_i^{\alpha,\beta}(v) = -\alpha \text{ch}_{i-2}^{\alpha,\beta}(v) \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_\beta \text{ch}_i^{\alpha,\beta}(v) = -\text{ch}_{i-1}^{\alpha,\beta}(v).
\]

Note that \(\tau_{e,s}(\alpha, \beta) = \text{ch}_3^{\alpha,\beta}(v) - \alpha^2(s - 1/3) \text{ch}_1^{\alpha,\beta}(v)\).

We also introduce

\[
\begin{align*}
\Delta_{ij}(\alpha, \beta) := & \ \text{ch}_i^{\alpha,\beta}(u) \text{ch}_j^{\alpha,\beta}(v) - \text{ch}_j^{\alpha,\beta}(u) \text{ch}_i^{\alpha,\beta}(v) \quad \text{and} \\
\delta_{ij}(u,v) := & \ \text{ch}_i(u) \text{ch}_j(v) - \text{ch}_j(u) \text{ch}_i(v) = \Delta_{ij}(0,0).
\end{align*}
\]

In particular, note that \(\Delta_{10}(\alpha, \beta) = \delta_{10}(u,v)\).

The following is an easy exercise:

Lemma 2.7. Fix real numerical Chern characters \(u\) and \(v\).

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) & \quad \Delta_{01} \Delta_{23} + \Delta_{02} \Delta_{31} + \Delta_{12} \Delta_{03} = 0, \\
(2) & \quad \text{The partial derivatives of } \Delta_{ij} \text{ are given by:} \\
& \quad \partial_\alpha \Delta_{ij}(\alpha, \beta) = -\alpha(\Delta_{i-2,j}(\alpha, \beta) + \Delta_{i,j-2}(\alpha, \beta)) \\
& \quad \partial_\beta \Delta_{ij}(\alpha, \beta) = -\left(\Delta_{i-1,j}(\alpha, \beta) + \Delta_{i,j-1}(\alpha, \beta)\right). \\
(3) & \quad \text{Assume either } \text{ch}_i^{\alpha,\beta}(u) \neq 0 \text{ or } \text{ch}_i^{\alpha,\beta}(v) \neq 0. \text{ Then, for any } i, j, k \in \{0,1,2,3\}, \text{ if } \Delta_{ij}(\alpha, \beta) = 0 = \Delta_{jk}(\alpha, \beta) \text{ then } \Delta_{ik}(\alpha, \beta) = 0. \\
(4) & \quad \text{The following are equivalent} \\
& \quad (a) \text{ there exist } \alpha, \beta \text{ and } i \in \{0,1,2,3\} \text{ such that } \text{ch}_i^{\alpha,\beta}(v) \neq 0 \text{ (or } \text{ch}_i^{\alpha,\beta}(u) \neq 0) \text{ and for all } j \in \{0,1,2,3\}, \Delta_{ij}(\alpha, \beta) = 0. \\
& \quad (b) \text{ for all } \alpha, \beta \text{ and for all } i, j \in \{0,1,2,3\}, \Delta_{ij}(\alpha, \beta) = 0. \\
& \quad (c) u \propto v.
\end{align*}
\]

In what follows, we will use \(M_{\alpha,\beta,s}(v)\) to denote the set of \(\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}\)-semistable objects with Chern character \(v\); Piyaratne and Toda proved in [31] that \(M_{\alpha,\beta,s}(v)\) has the structure of an algebraic stack, locally of finite type over \(\mathbb{C}\).
2.3. The second tilt category. We will now collect some useful facts about the
objects in the second tilt category $A^{\alpha,\beta}(X)$. Much of the following is well known
and is easy to deduce in various ad hoc ways but we give a novel treatment using
higher octahedra which is of independent interest (the idea first appeared in [3]).
We will henceforth drop the $X$ from the notation $A^{\alpha,\beta}$. Recall that $H^i$ denotes
cohomology in $\text{Coh}(X)$ and $H^i_B$ denotes cohomology in $B^\beta$.

Suppose $A \in A^{\alpha,\beta}$ for some $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{E}$. We write $A = H^i_A$ and $A_{ij} = H^{-j}(A_i)$. So we have three distinguished triangles:
\begin{align}
& A_{11}[1] \to A_1 \to A_{10}; \\
& A_{01}[1] \to A_0 \to A_{00}; \\
& A_1[1] \to A \to A_0.
\end{align}

Because these triangles intersect we can arrange them into a diagram as follows:
\begin{equation}
\begin{array}{c}
A_{01} \to A_0[1] \to A_1[1] \to A_{10}[1] \\
A_0[1] \to C \to A_1[1] \to A_{10}[1] \\
A_{00}[1] \to C \to A_1[1] \to A_{10}[1] \\
A \to A_0 \to A_1[1] \to A_{10}[1] \\
A_{11}[3] \to A_1[2] \to A_{10}[2]
\end{array}
\end{equation}

Here the squiggly arrows $X \sim Y$ mean $X \to Y[1]$. The diagram is meant to
repeat infinitely above and to the right by shifting $[-n]$ and $[n]$. Every square
commutes and the triangles along the diagonal are distinguished. Furthermore,
each triple of morphisms formed by composing horizontally and then vertically and
then looping back via the repeated diagram to the right are distinguished. The
additional objects $C$, $C'$ and $\tilde{A}[1]$ are defined as cones on suitable composites.

Three of the triangles are given in display (12) and the remaining seven are:
\begin{align}
& A_1[1] \to C \to A_{01}[1] \to A_1[2]; \\
& A_{10}[1] \to C' \to A_0 \to A_{10}[2]; \\
& A_{10}[1] \to \tilde{A}[1] \to A_{01}[1] \to A_{10}[2]; \\
& C \to A \to A_{00} \to C[1]; \\
& A_{11}[2] \to A \to C' \to A_{11}[3]; \\
& A_{11}[2] \to C \to \tilde{A}[1] \to A_{11}[3]; \\
& \tilde{A}[1] \to C' \to A_{00} \to \tilde{A}[2].
\end{align}

The first two tell us what the $B^\beta$-cohomologies of $C$ and $C'$ are. The third tells is
that $\tilde{A} \in \text{Coh}(X)$. The fourth and fifth tell us what the $A^{\alpha,\beta}$-cohomologies of $C$
and $C'$ are, and the final two tell us what the $\text{Coh}(X)$-cohomologies of $C$ and $C'$
are. In particular, we have that
\begin{align}
& H^{-2}(A) \simeq A_{11}, \quad H^{-1}(A) = \tilde{A} \quad \text{and} \quad H^0(A) \simeq A_{00}.
\end{align}
There are also five distinguished octahedra which are obtained by removing one row and column from the diagram in display (13) (for a more concrete example of an octahedron in this form see the diagrams [20]) in the proof of Prop 2.15). The diagram can also be represented as a four dimensional shape given as a truncated 5-simplex with five octahedral and five tetrahedral faces. Another way to express the diagram is that $A$ is filtered in $D^b(X)$ by

$$A_{00}[-3] \to A_{01}[-1] \to A_{10} \to A_{11}[2] \to A$$

with factors $A_0[-2], \tilde{A}$ and $A_1[1]$ respectively.

Observe that $A_{11} \in T$, and these must be torsion free sheaves, while $A_{00} \in T$ and, in particular, $A_{00} \in A^\alpha_\beta$. In fact, a slightly stronger statement is true.

**Lemma 2.8.** If $A \in A^\alpha_\beta$ for some $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{H}$, then $\mathcal{H}^{-2}(A)$ must be a reflexive sheaf.

**Proof.** Assume $\mathcal{H}^{-2}(A) \simeq A_{11}$ is not reflexive, and $T := A_{11}^+/A_{11} \neq 0$. Then $T \to A_{11}[1]$ is a monomorphism in $\mathcal{B}^\beta$. Since $A_{11}$ is a $\mathcal{B}^\beta$-subobject of $A_1$, it must have $\nu_{\alpha_\beta}(A_{11}) \leq 0$. However, $\nu_{\alpha_\beta}(T) = +\infty$, providing a contradiction. \qed

The following fact will also be useful later on.

**Lemma 2.9.** If $A \in A^\alpha_\beta$ for some $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{H}$ satisfies $\mathcal{H}^{-2}(A) = \mathcal{H}^{-1}(\mathcal{H}^0_\beta(A)) = 0$, then $\mathcal{H}^p(A) \simeq \mathcal{H}^p_\beta(A)$ and for $p = -1, 0$.

**Proof.** Chasing through the seven triangles listed in display (14) with $A_{11} = A_{01} = 0$, one concludes that $\tilde{A} \simeq C \simeq A_1$, which is the same as $\mathcal{H}^{-1}(A) \simeq \mathcal{H}^{-1}_\beta(A)$ by the isomorphisms in (15). The vanishing of $A_{01}$ also implies that $A_0 \simeq A_{00}$ by the sequences in display (12), hence $\mathcal{H}^0_\beta(A) \simeq \mathcal{H}^0_\beta(A)$. \qed

**Lemma 2.10.** If $A \in A^\alpha_\beta \cap \mathcal{B}^\beta$ and $B \hookrightarrow A \to C$ is a short exact sequence in $A^\alpha_\beta$, then there are in $A^\alpha_\beta$ a short exact sequence $D \hookrightarrow A \to C'$, a quotient $B \twoheadrightarrow D$ and an injection $C \hookrightarrow C'$ such that $C', D \in \mathcal{B}^\beta$.

**Proof.** Apply $\mathcal{H}_\beta$ to get a long exact sequence in $\mathcal{B}^\beta$:

$$0 \to C_1 \to B \to A \to C_0 \to 0.$$

Split this via $D$. Then $\nu_{\alpha_\beta}(D) > 0$ and so $D \in A^\alpha_\beta$. Then we have a short exact sequence $D \to A \to C'$ in $A^\alpha_\beta$ together with an injection $C \hookrightarrow C'$ and a surjection $B \twoheadrightarrow D$ also in $A^\alpha_\beta$ as required. \qed

**Lemma 2.11.** If $A \in A^\alpha_\beta \cap \mathcal{B}^\beta[1]$ and $B \hookrightarrow A \to C$ is a short exact sequence in $A^\alpha_\beta$ then there are in $A^\alpha_\beta$ a short exact sequence $B' \hookrightarrow A \to D$, a subobject $B' \hookrightarrow B$ and a quotient $D \to C$ with $B', D \in \mathcal{B}^\beta[1]$.

**Proof.** Apply $\mathcal{H}_\beta$ to get a long exact sequence in $\mathcal{B}^\beta$:

$$0 \to B_1 \to A_1 \to C_1 \to B_0 \to 0.$$

Split this via $D[-1]$. Then $\nu_{\alpha_\beta}(D) \leq 0$ and so $D \in A^\alpha_\beta$. Then we have a short exact sequence $B_1[1] \hookrightarrow A \to D$ in $A^\alpha_\beta$ together with an injection $B[1] \hookrightarrow B$ and a surjection $D \twoheadrightarrow C_1[1] = C$ in $A^\alpha_\beta$ as required. \qed

**Proposition 2.12.** Suppose $E \in A^\alpha_\beta \cap \text{Coh}(X)$. If $D \to E$ is a monomorphism in $A^\alpha_\beta$, then $E \in \mathcal{B}^\beta$, and there is an $F \in \text{Coh}(X) \cap A^\alpha_\beta$ such that
(1) $F \in \mathcal{B}^\beta$

(2) there are a surjection $D \to F$ and an injection $F \to E$ in $\mathcal{A}^{\alpha,\beta}$;

(3) either $E/F \in \mathcal{B}^\beta \cap \operatorname{Coh}(X)$ or $(E/F)[-1] \in \mathcal{B}^\beta \cap \operatorname{Coh}(X)$.

Proof. If $A = E \in \mathcal{A}^{\alpha,\beta} \cap \operatorname{Coh}(X)$ then the triangles [12] and [14] imply $C = 0$ and then $A_1[1]$ is a sheaf and so $A_1 = 0$. This establishes $E \in \mathcal{B}^\beta$ and (1).

For (2), observe that $D_{11}[2] \to E$ must vanish and so $D \to E$ lifts to $C' \to E$ (where we set $A = D$ as above) and then $D_{10}[1] \to E$ is zero and so this lifts to $D_0 \to E$. But $D_0[1] \to E$ also vanishes and so lifts to $D_00 \to E$. This need not inject but if it does not then we can factor it through its image $D'$. Then we repeat. This gives an increasing sequence of subobjects of $E$ which must stabilize finitely as $\mathcal{A}^{\alpha,\beta}$ is artinian. If it stabilizes at $F$, it must be because $F = F_{00}$ and so $F \in \operatorname{Coh}(X) \cap \mathcal{A}^{\alpha,\beta}$ and there is a surjection $D \to F$ as required.

Let $E/F = B$. Then, taking cohomology in $\mathcal{B}^\beta$ we have a long exact sequence in $\mathcal{B}^\beta$:

$$0 \to B_1 \to F \to E \to B_0 \to 0$$

If $B_0 = 0$ then $E/F \in \mathcal{B}^\beta[1]$ and the long exact sequence in $\operatorname{Coh}(X)$ from the triangle $F \to E \to B$ implies that $B_{11} = 0$ and so $B[-1] \in \operatorname{Coh}(X) \cap \mathcal{B}^\beta$.

Otherwise, $B_0 \neq 0$. Again $B_{11} = \mathcal{H}^{-2}(B) = 0$. Split the map $F \to E$ via $Q \in \mathcal{B}$. Then from the triangle $B_1 \to F \to Q$ we have $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}(Q) > 0$ and so $Q \in \mathcal{A}^{\alpha,\beta}$ and, by the construction of $F$, $Q = F \in \operatorname{Coh}(X)$ and $B_1 = 0$. If $E \to B_{00}$ is not a surjection then the kernel $K$ in $\operatorname{Coh}(X)$ satisfies $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}(K) \geq \nu_{\alpha,\beta}(F) > 0$ and so $K \in \mathcal{B}^\beta$ and then $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}(K) > 0$ and so $K \in \mathcal{A}^{\alpha,\beta}$. But then $K = F = Q$ again from the construction of $F$ so $B_{01} = 0$. Hence $B \in \mathcal{B}^\beta \cap \operatorname{Coh}(X)$ as required. \hfill \Box

2.4 Duals of semistable sheaves. Given an object $A \in D^b(X)$, we denote its derived dual by $A' := R\operatorname{Hom}(A,\mathcal{O}_X)[2]$. For a sheaf $E$, its derived dual $E'$ satisfies $\mathcal{H}^j(E') = \mathcal{E}xt^{j+2}(E,\mathcal{O}_X)$ for $j = -2, -1, 0, 1$, and $\mathcal{H}^j(E') = 0$ otherwise. If $E$ is torsion free, then we have the following short exact sequence in $\operatorname{Coh}(X)$

$$0 \to E \to E'' \to Q_E \to 0, \quad Q_E := E''/E,$$

where $E^* := \operatorname{Hom}(E,\mathcal{O}_X)$. Note that $\dim Q_E \leq 1$; letting $Z_E$ be the maximal 0-dimensional subsheaf of $Q_E$, define $T_E := Q_E/Z_E$. Let $E'$ be the kernel of the composed epimorphism $E'' \to Q_E \to T_E$; it fits into the following short exact sequence in $\operatorname{Coh}(X)$:

$$0 \to E' \to E'\to 0.$$

We then have that $\mathcal{H}^j(E') = 0$ for $j \neq -2, -1, 0$, and

$$\mathcal{H}^{-2}(E') = E^* \simeq E'^*, \quad \mathcal{H}^{-1}(E') = \mathcal{E}xt^1(E,\mathcal{O}_X) \simeq \mathcal{E}xt^1(E',\mathcal{O}_X) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H}^0(E') = \mathcal{E}xt^2(E,\mathcal{O}_X) \simeq \mathcal{E}xt^3(Z_E,\mathcal{O}_X).$$

Moreover, $\mathcal{E}xt^1(E,\mathcal{O}_X) \simeq \mathcal{E}xt^1(E',\mathcal{O}_X)$ fits into the short exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{E}xt^1(E'',\mathcal{O}_X) \to \mathcal{E}xt^1(E,\mathcal{O}_X) \to \mathcal{E}xt^2(T_E,\mathcal{O}_X) \to 0.$$

Clearly, $E^* \in \mathcal{B}^\beta$ for $\beta > \mu^+(E^*)$, while $\mathcal{E}xt^1(E,\mathcal{O}_X) \in T_\beta$ for every $\beta$; it follows that $E''[-1] \in \mathcal{B}^\beta$ for every $\beta > \mu^+(E^*)$. In addition, $Z_E^\beta[1]$ is a 0-dimensional sheaf, so $Z_E^\beta[1] \in T_\beta \subset \mathcal{B}^\beta$ for every $\beta$. Comparing with the triangle

$$E'' \to E' \to Z_E^{\beta}[1],$$

obtained from dualizing the sequence in display [17], then we have proved:
Proposition 2.13. If $E$ is a torsion free sheaf and

$$0 \to E \to E' \to Z_E \to 0$$

is the sequence above where $Z_E$ is the maximal 0-dimensional subsheaf of $E'^*/E$ then

$$H^{-1}_\beta(E') \simeq E'^*[−1] \quad \text{and} \quad H^0_\beta(E') \simeq Z_E'[1] \simeq \mathcal{E}xt^2(E, \mathcal{O}_X),$$

whenever $\beta > \mu^+(E^*)$.

We can also formulate a converse to this construction. Let $\text{Coh}(X)_d$ denote the category coherent sheaves on $X$ of dimension $\leq d$. We want to be able to characterize when an object $A \in D^b(X)$ which has cohomology in 3 consecutive places $A^i$, $A^{i+1}$ and $A^{i+2}$ such that $A^i$ is reflexive and $A^{i+j} \in \text{Coh}(X)_{2-j}$ for $j = 1, 2$, is the shift of the dual of a torsion free sheaf. We will make use of this when we analyze the asymptotics for $\beta \gg 0$ and we will express them in the form of lifting properties. First we need a technical lemma as an intermediate step. The equivalent statement in dimension 2 is an easy exercise: if $A$ has cohomology in two places with $A^i$ locally-free and $A^{i+1} \in \text{Coh}(X)_0$ such that any subsheaf $S \to A^{i+1}$ does not lift to $A$ then $A$ is the shift of the dual of a torsion free sheaf.

Lemma 2.14. An object $A \in D^b(X)$ satisfies the following conditions

1. $H^i(A) = 0$, $i \neq -2, -1, 0$,
2. $F := H^{-2}(A)$ is a reflexive sheaf,
3. $G := H^{-1}(A) \in \text{Coh}(X)_1$,
4. $S := H^0(A) \in \text{Coh}(X)_0$,
5. the induced map $F^* \to \mathcal{E}xt^2(G, \mathcal{O}_X)$ surjects with kernel $K$, say,
6. the induced map $\mathcal{E}xt^1(F, \mathcal{O}_X) \to \mathcal{E}xt^3(G, \mathcal{O}_X)$ is an isomorphism, and
7. the induced map $f : K \to \mathcal{E}xt^3(S, \mathcal{O}_X)$ surjects,

if and only if $E := A^\vee \cong \ker f$ is a torsion free sheaf.

Proof. To see where these induced maps come from consider the triangles

$$F[2] \to A \to \tilde{F} \to F[3]$$

$$G[1] \to \tilde{F} \to S \to G[2].$$

Then we have maps

$$\mathcal{H}om(F, \mathcal{O}_X) \to \mathcal{R}\mathcal{H}om(\tilde{F}[-3], \mathcal{O}_X) \to \mathcal{R}\mathcal{H}om(G[-2], \mathcal{O}_X) \cong \mathcal{E}xt^2(G, \mathcal{O}_X)$$

and $\mathcal{E}xt^1(F, \mathcal{O}_X) \to \mathcal{R}\mathcal{H}om(\tilde{F}[-4], \mathcal{O}_X) \to \mathcal{E}xt^3(G, \mathcal{O}_X)$. The final one arises because there is a short exact sequence of sheaves:

$$0 \to \mathcal{E}xt^3(S, \mathcal{O}_X) \to \mathcal{E}xt^3(\tilde{F}, \mathcal{O}_X) \to \mathcal{E}xt^2(G, \mathcal{O}_X) \to 0.$$  

and so the $K \to \mathcal{E}xt^3(\tilde{F}, \mathcal{O}_X)$ lifts to $K \to \mathcal{E}xt^3(S, \mathcal{O}_X)$.

The lemma follows immediately from the spectral sequence

$$\mathcal{E}xt^{-p}(H^q(A), \mathcal{O}_X) \Rightarrow H^{q+p}(A^\vee)$$

which converges on the third page to a single entry at $(p, q) = (0, -2)$. Note that $E$ is torsion free because it is the subsheaf of a reflexive sheaf (namely $F^*$). We also have that $E' \cong K$, $Z_E \cong \mathcal{E}xt^3(S, \mathcal{O}_X)$, $Q_E \cong \mathcal{E}xt^2(G, \mathcal{O}_X)$ and $T_E \cong \mathcal{E}xt^3(G, \mathcal{O}_X)$. □

We can give a more categorical description of the conditions as follows
Let us consider the octahedron 
\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
B[1] & \rightarrow & A \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
G[1] & \rightarrow & F \\
\end{array} \]

We observe that the triangle \( F'[-2] \rightarrow G' \rightarrow B' \) shows that when Lemma \ref{lemma} holds, \( B' = K[1] \).

Suppose first that \( K \rightarrow \mathcal{E}xt^{3}(S, \mathcal{O}_{X}) \) fails to surject. Let the quotient be denoted by \( T \); this is in \( \text{Coh}(X)_{0} \) and let \( S' \) be \( \mathcal{E}xt(T, \mathcal{O}_{X}) \). Then \( S' \rightarrow S \) and the composite with \( S \rightarrow B'[2] \) vanishes and so lifts to \( A \) as required.

Now suppose that Lemma \ref{lemma} or \ref{lemma} fails. Applying cohomology to the left vertical triangle of our octahedron we have
\[
0 \rightarrow B^{-1} \rightarrow F^{*} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}xt^{2}(G, \mathcal{O}_{X}) \rightarrow B^{0} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}xt^{1}(F, \mathcal{O}_{X}) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}xt^{3}(G, \mathcal{O}_{X}) \rightarrow B^{1} \rightarrow 0
\]
Then the cone on \( B^{-1} \rightarrow B \) is the dual of an object \( G' \) supported in dimension 1 and there is a map \( G' \rightarrow G \) which lifts to \( G' \rightarrow B \). But there are no morphisms \( G'[1] \rightarrow T'[-1] \) and so this lifts to a non-zero map \( G'[1] \rightarrow A \) as required.

**Remark 2.16.** We can rephrase item (5) in Proposition \ref{proposition} to say that if \( K \rightarrow A \) is a map from a sheaf in \( \text{Coh}(X)_{0} \) then the induced map \( K \rightarrow S \) must be zero. Similarly, (6) becomes the statement that if \( K[1] \rightarrow A \) is a map with \( K \in \text{Coh}(X)_{1} \) then the induced map \( K \rightarrow G \) must be zero. In practice, these are easier to test but we will make more use of the conditions stated in Proposition \ref{proposition}.

We complete this section by introducing a stability condition in \( \text{Coh}(X) \) which interpolates between \( \mu \)-stability and Gieseker stability; it will play a role in some of the proofs below.

The Hilbert polynomial of a coherent sheaf \( E \) on \( X \) with respect to the polarization \( L \) is
\[
P_{E}(t) := \chi(E \otimes L^{\otimes t}) = \text{ch}_{0}(E)\chi(L^{\otimes t}) + \text{ch}_{1}(E)x_{2}(t) + \text{ch}_{2}(E)x_{1}(t) + \text{ch}_{3}(E),
\]
where
\[ x_2(t) := \left( \frac{1}{2} t^2 L^2 + t \text{td}_1(X) \cdot L + \text{td}_2(X) \right), \quad x_1(t) := (tL + \text{td}_1(X)), \]
and \( \text{td}_i(X) \) denote the Todd classes of \( X \). If \( F \) is another coherent free sheaf on \( X \), we define, following [32, Section 2]:
\[ \Lambda(E, F) := (\delta_{10}(E, F), \delta_{20}(E, F), \delta_{30}(E, F), \delta_{31}(E, F), \delta_{32}(E, F)), \]
where \( \delta_{ij}(E, F) := \delta_{ij}(\text{ch}(E), \text{ch}(F)) \) following the notation introduced in display (11).

We remark that a coherent sheaf \( E \) is Gieseker (semi)stable if and only if every proper, nontrivial subsheaf \( F \hookrightarrow E \) satisfies \( \Lambda(E, F) > (\geq) 0 \) in the lexicographic order. For instance, assume that \( E \) is torsion free, and let \( F \hookrightarrow E \) be a proper subsheaf; letting \( p_E(t) \) denote the reduced Hilbert polynomial of the sheaf \( E \), we have
\[ p_E(t) - p_F(t) = \frac{1}{\text{ch}_{10}(E) \text{ch}_0(F)} \left( \delta_{10}(E, F)x_2(t) + \delta_{20}(E, F)x_1(t) + \delta_{30}(E, F) \right), \]
so \( E \) is Gieseker (semi)stable if and only if
\[ (\delta_{10}(E, F), \delta_{20}(E, F), \delta_{30}(E, F)) > (\geq) 0 \]
in the lexicographic order. Similarly, a torsion free sheaf \( E \) is Gieseker (semi)stable if and only if every quotient sheaf \( E \twoheadrightarrow G \) satisfies
\[ (\delta_{10}(E, G), \delta_{20}(E, G), \delta_{30}(E, G)) < (\leq) 0 \]
in the lexicographic order.

In what follows, it will be important to consider another notion of stability for torsion free sheaves, which is equivalent to the notion of stability in the category \( \text{Coh}_{3,1}(X) \) in the sense of [18] Definition 1.6.3.

**Definition 2.17.** A torsion free sheaf \( E \) on \( X \) is said to be \( \mu_{\leq 2}\)-(semi)stable if every proper, nontrivial subsheaf \( F \hookrightarrow E \) satisfies \( (\delta_{10}(E, F), \delta_{20}(E, F)) > (\geq) 0 \) in the lexicographic order.

For the sheaf \( E' \) defined as in display (10), we observe that:
(i) \( E \) is \( \mu \)-(semi)stable if and only if \( E' \) is \( \mu \)-(semi)stable;
(ii) \( E \) is \( \mu_{\leq 2}\)-(semi)stable if and only if \( E' \) is \( \mu_{\leq 2}\)-(semi)stable.

The first claim follows from the fact that \( E'^* = E^* \). For the second claim, note that \( \text{ch}_{\leq 2}(E') = \text{ch}_{\leq 2}(E) \), since \( E'/E \) is 0-dimensional; in addition, any subsheaf \( F' \hookrightarrow E' \) will induce a subsheaf \( F \hookrightarrow E \) such that \( \text{ch}_{\leq 2}(F') = \text{ch}_{\leq 2}(F) \).

Clearly, one has the following chains of implications:
\[ \mu\text{-stable} \Rightarrow \mu_{\leq 2}\text{-stable} \Rightarrow \text{Gieseker stable} \Rightarrow \]
\[ \Rightarrow \text{Gieseker semistable} \Rightarrow \mu_{\leq 2}\text{-semistable} \Rightarrow \mu\text{-semistable}. \]

**Example 2.18.** It is not hard to find explicit examples that show that the reverse implications do not hold in general. Indeed, for \( X = \mathbb{P}^3 \), let \( S \) be a rank 2 reflexive sheaf given as an extension of an ideal sheaf of a line \( L \subset \mathbb{P}^3 \) by \( \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \); note that \( \text{ch}(S) = (2, 0, -1, 1) \). Let \( C \subset \mathbb{P}^3 \) be curve, and consider an epimorphism \( \varphi : F \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{O}_C(k) \); define \( E_{\varphi} := \ker \varphi \).

(1) if \( C \) is a line not intersecting \( L \) and \( k > 0 \), then \( E_{\varphi} \) is \( \mu_{\leq 2}\)-semistable, but not Gieseker semistable;
(2) if $C$ is a conic not intersecting $L$ and $k = 0$, then $E_\varphi$ is $\mu$-stable, but not $\mu$-stable;
(3) if $C$ is a line intersecting $L$ in a single point, then $E_\varphi$ is Gieseker stable, but not $\mu$-stable.

Finally, we also recall the following notion of stability for sheaves of dimension 2, compare with [17, Definition 1.6.8].

**Definition 2.19.** A torsion sheaf $T \in \text{Coh}(X)_2$ on $X$ is said to be $\mu$-(semi)stable if it is pure, and every subsheaf $U \subset T$ satisfies

$$\mu(U) := \frac{u_2}{u_1} < (\leq) \frac{\text{ch}_2(T)}{\text{ch}_1(T)} = \hat{\mu}(T).$$

Setting $\Lambda_2(E, F) := (\delta_{10}(E, F), \delta_{20}(E, F), \delta_{21}(E, F))$, we introduce the following version of the Harder–Narasimhan filtration, which will be useful later on.

**Lemma 2.20.** Every sheaf $E$ admits a filtration $0 = E_0 \subseteq E_1 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq E_n = E$ satisfying the following conditions:

1. $\dim E_1 \leq 1$, and $\dim E_k \geq 2$ for every $k \geq 2$;
2. each factor $G_k := E_k/E_{k-1}$ for $k \geq 2$ is either $\mu$-semistable (if $\dim E_k/E_{k-1} = 2$) or $\mu_{\leq 2}$-semistable (if $E_k/E_{k-1}$ is torsion free), and $\Lambda_2(G_k, G_{k+1}) > 0$ for $k = 1, \ldots, n - 1$.

**Proof.** Let $E_1$ be the maximal subsheaf of $E$ of dimension at most 1, so that $F := E/T$ has dimension at least 2. Note that this $E_1$ might be the zero sheaf.

Next, let $F = F_0 \rightarrow F_1 \rightarrow \cdots \subset F_n = 0$ be the Harder–Narasimhan cofiltration of $F$ as an object in the category $\text{Coh}_{3,1}(X)$, in the sense of [17, Theorem 1.6.7]; each $F_k$ is a sheaf of dimension at least 2 either $\hat{\mu}$- or $\mu_{\leq 2}$-semistable. Composing with $E \rightarrow F$ provides our required cofiltration and hence filtration in the usual way. \hfill $\Box$

3. **Regions of $\mathbb{H}$**

Let $v$ be a real numerical Chern character with $v_0 \neq 0$ and satisfying $Q^{\text{tilt}}(v) \geq 0$. It follows that the curve

$$\Theta_v := \{\rho_v(\alpha, \beta) = 0\}$$

is a hyperbola in $\mathbb{H}$, centered around the vertical line $\{\beta = \mu(v)\}$; explicitly:

$$\rho_v(\alpha, \beta) = 0 \iff (\beta - \mu(v))^2 - \alpha^2 = \frac{Q^{\text{tilt}}(v)}{v_0^2}. \quad (21)$$

When $v$ fails the Bogomolov inequality we still occasionally still consider $\Theta_v$, but now it is a single branch hyperbola cutting the $\alpha$-axis.

The hyperbola $\Theta_v$ divides $\mathbb{H}$ up into three regions $R^- \sqcup R^0 \sqcup R^+$ defined as follows:

$$R^-_v = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mid \rho_v(\alpha, \beta) > 0 \text{ and } \beta < \mu(v)\},$$

$$R^0_v = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mid \rho_v(\alpha, \beta) < 0 \text{ or } \rho_v(\alpha, \beta) = 0 \text{ and } \beta < \mu(v)\},$$

and

$$R^+_v = \{(\alpha, \beta) \mid \rho_v(\alpha, \beta) \geq 0 \text{ and } \beta > \mu(v)\}.$$

Notice that $R^-_v$ does not include any of $\Theta_v$, whereas $R^0_v$ and $R^+_v$ include the branch of $\Theta_v$ to their left. In addition, $R^0_v$ is split in half by the vertical line $\{\beta = v_1/v_0\}$;
we shall denote these regions by \( R^+_v \) and \( R^-_v \) (to include the vertical line) to the left and right, respectively. These regions are illustrated in Figure 1.

The categories \( A^{\alpha,\beta} \) along the curve \( \Theta_v \) satisfy some strong conditions. These form the basis for Theorem \( \ref{prop:main} \) (see also \( \cite{lemma} \) Lemma 6.2 and 6.4).

**Proposition 3.1.** If \( A \in A^{\alpha,\beta}(X) \) with \( \text{ch}(A) = v \) and \( (\alpha, \beta) \in \Theta_v \), then, for every \( s > 0 \), \( A \) is \( \lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s} \)-semistable, \( \mathcal{H}^0_\beta(A) \in \text{Coh}(X)_0 \), and \( \mathcal{H}^{-1}_\beta(A) \) is \( \nu_{\alpha,\beta} \)-semistable.

Conversely, if \( B \in \mathcal{B}^\beta(X) \) with \( \text{ch}_{\leq 2}(B) = \text{ch}_{\leq 2}(v) \) is \( \nu_{\alpha,\beta} \)-semistable for some \( (\alpha, \beta) \in \Theta_v \) and \( P \in \text{Coh}(X)_0 \), then every non-trivial extension \( A \in \text{Ext}^1(P, B[1]) \) with \( \text{ch}(A) = v \) belongs to \( A^{\alpha,\beta}(X) \) and is \( \lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s} \)-semistable for every \( s > 0 \).

**Proof.** Suppose \( F \hookrightarrow A \) is a subobject in \( A^{\alpha,\beta}(X) \). Since \( \rho_A(\alpha, \beta) = 0 \), we have that \( \rho_F(\alpha, \beta) = 0 \) as well, thus \( \lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}(F) = \infty \). Similarly for quotient objects. Hence, \( E \) is \( \lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s} \)-semistable for every \( s > 0 \).

Now write \( A \) as

\[
0 \to A[1] \to A \to A_0 \to 0
\]

in \( A^{\alpha,\beta}(X) \). As in the argument above, we also conclude that \( \rho_{A_0}(\alpha, \beta) = 0 \). However, this contradicts \( \nu_{\alpha,\beta}^{-}(A_0) > 0 \) unless \( A_0 \in \text{Coh}(X)_0 \). Since \( A_1 \in \mathcal{F}_{\alpha,\beta} \), we have \( \nu_{\alpha,\beta}^{-}(A_1) \leq 0 = \nu_{\alpha,\beta}^{-}(A_1) \) and so \( A_1 \) is \( \nu_{\alpha,\beta} \)-semistable.

For the second statement, note that every sub-object \( F \hookrightarrow B \) within \( \mathcal{B}^\beta(X) \) satisfies \( \nu_{\alpha,\beta}(F) \leq \nu_{\alpha,\beta}(B) = 0 \), since \( B \) is \( \nu_{\alpha,\beta} \)-semistable and \( (\alpha, \beta) \in \Theta_v \). It follows that \( B \in \mathcal{F}_{\alpha,\beta} \), thus \( B[1] \in A^{\alpha,\beta}(X) \). Since \( P \in \text{Coh}(X)_0 \), then \( P \in \mathcal{T}_{\alpha,\beta} \) for every \( (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{H} \), thus any extension \( A \in \text{Ext}^1(P, B[1]) \) does belong to \( A^{\alpha,\beta}(X) \). For every \( s > 0 \), \( \lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}(A) = +\infty \) because \( (\alpha, \beta) \in \Theta_v \), thus \( A \) must be \( \lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s} \)-semistable. \( \square \)

The next step is to understand the vanishing locus of \( \lambda \)-slope for a given numerical Chern vector \( v \), and to study its relative position with respect to \( \Theta_v \).

**Definition 3.2.** For any real numerical Chern character \( v \) and \( s \geq 0 \), we define the curve

\[
\Gamma_{v,s} := \{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{H} \mid \tau_{v,s}(\alpha, \beta) = 0\}.
\]

In addition, we set \( \Gamma_{v,s}^\bullet := \Gamma_{v,s} \cap R_v^\bullet \), with \( \bullet = -, 0, + \).

The curve \( \Gamma_{v,s} \) is given explicitly by

\[
(22) \quad v_0(\beta^3 - 3v_1\beta^2 + (6v_2 - (6s + 1)v_0\alpha^2)\beta + ((6s + 1)v_1\alpha^2 - 6v_3)) = 0.
\]

If \( v_0 \neq 0 \), equation (22) is cubic on \( \beta \), hence \( \Gamma_{v,s} \) has at most three connected components. In fact, there exists \( \alpha_0 > 0 \) such that

\[
\Gamma_{v,s} \cap \{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{H} \mid \alpha > \alpha_0\}
\]

has exactly three connected components. Two of these components are asymptotic to lines \( \alpha_0v_0v_3 + 1 = \pm(\beta - v_1/v_0) \), and therefore lie in the regions \( R^\pm_v \); these are the curves \( \Gamma_{v,s}^\bullet \) in Definition 3.2 above. The third component, namely \( \Gamma_0^\pm \), either coincides with or is asymptotic to the vertical line \( \beta = v_1/v_0 \).

**Example 3.3.** When \( v = (m, 0, -n, 0) \) for some \( m, n > 0 \), then equation (22) simplifies to

\[
(m\beta^2 - (6s + 1)m\alpha^2 - 6n)\beta = 0,
\]

so \( \Gamma_{v,s} \) consists of exactly three components: \( \Gamma_{v,s}^\pm \) are the two branches of the hyperbola \( \beta^2 - (6s+1)\alpha^2 = 6n/m \), and \( \Gamma_0^\pm \) coincides with the vertical axis \( \beta = 0 \).
In the limit $s \to 0$, assuming also that the Bogomolov inequality $v_1^2 \geq 2v_0v_2$ holds for $v$, the curves $\Gamma_{v,s=0}^\pm$ are co-asymptotic with the two branches of the the hyperbola $\Theta_v$.

It turns out that the position of the different branches of cubic curve $\Gamma_{v,s}$ relative to the two branches of the hyperbola $\Theta_v$ has an important geometric meaning, which is unravelled in the following two statements.

**Proposition 3.4.** Let $v$ be a real numerical Chern character with $v_0 \neq 0$ and satisfying the Bogomolov inequality \([\ref{Bo}].\) If, for each $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{H}$, there is an object $E \in \mathcal{A}^{\alpha, \beta}(X)$ with $\text{ch}(E) = v$, then $\Gamma_{v,s}$ consists of exactly three connected components:

$$\Gamma_{v,s}^- \sqcup \Gamma_{v,s}^0 \sqcup \Gamma_{v,s}^+$$

and,

$$(23) \quad q(E) := 3v_1^2v_2^2 - 6v_1^3v_3 + 18v_0v_1v_2v_3 - 8v_0v_2^2 - 9v_0^2v_3^2 \geq 0.\)$$

**Proof.** The hypotheses imply that the three asymptotic branches $\Gamma_{v,s}^\bullet$ for $\bullet = +, - , 0$ all the way down to the horizontal axis $\{\alpha = 0\}$, and so we have three distinct irreducible components as given.

Recall that a cubic equation admits three distinct real roots exactly when its discriminant is positive. Regarding equation \([\ref{disc}]\) as a cubic in $\beta$, an easy computation gives its discriminant as (108 times)

$$(24) \quad q_\alpha(E) := \alpha^6v_0^4(6s + 1)^3 + 9\alpha^4v_2^2(6s + 1)^2(v_1^2 - 2v_0v_1) + 27\alpha^2(6s + 1)(v_1^2 - 2v_0v_1)^2 + 27(3v_1^2v_2^2 - 6v_1^3v_3 + 18v_0v_1v_2v_3 - 8v_0v_2^2 - 9v_0^2v_3^2).$$

Setting $\alpha = 0$ yields \([\ref{disc}]\). Finally we need to know that $q_\alpha$ can only change sign once as $\alpha$ varies. To see that observe that

$$\frac{dq_\alpha(E)}{d\alpha^2} = 3(6s + 1)(v_0^2(6s + 1)\alpha^2 + 3(v_1^2 - 2v_0v_2))^2 > 0.$$ 

So as a cubic in $\alpha^2$, $q_\alpha$ has a single point of inflection and so can change sign at most once. Note that, since $v_1^2 \geq 2v_0v_1$, the point of inflection does not occur for any $\alpha > 0$. $\square$

We also make use of the following:

**Definition 3.5.** Suppose $v_0 \neq 0$ and $Q^{\text{III}}(v) \geq 0$. We define the region $R_{v,s}^L$ to be

$$\{ (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{H} \mid \alpha < \alpha_0, \text{ whenever } (\alpha_0, \beta) \in \Gamma_{v,s}^- \} \cap R_v^-.$$ 

Alternatively,

$$R_{v,s}^L = \{ (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{H} \mid v_0\tau_{v,s}(\alpha, \beta) \geq 0 \} \cap R_v^-.$$ 

Note that, if $q(v) < 0$, then $\Gamma_{v,s}$ intersects $\Theta_v$. This is illustrated in the red curve of Figure \([\ref{fig}]\). On the other hand, away from $\Theta_v$ and $\beta = \mu(v)$, $\Gamma_{v,1/3}$ is strictly monotonic. This is because $\partial_{\beta} \chi_3^{\alpha, \beta}(v) = - \chi_2^{\alpha, \beta}(v)$.

**Proposition 3.6.** Let $v$ be a real numerical Chern character with $v_0 \neq 0$ and satisfying the Bogomolov inequality \([\ref{Bo}].\) If $q(v) < 0$ then $\Gamma_{v,s}$ intersects the left branch of $\Theta_v$ if and only if

$$v_0^2v_3 > v_0v_1v_2 - \frac{1}{3}v_1^3.$$
Proof. This is easiest to see by considering the sign of \( \lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}(v) \) for very small \( \alpha \) (we can just take \( \alpha = 0 \)). Observe that for \( \beta \to -\infty \) the sign is positive and it changes sign when we cross either \( \Gamma_{v,s} \) or \( \Theta_v \). If \( q(v) < 0 \) then \( \Gamma_{v,s} \) crosses the \( \beta \) axis exactly once. Observe that \( \lambda_{0,\beta,s}(v) = 0 \) for \( \beta > \mu(v) \) if and only if \( \Gamma_{v,s} \) intersects the left branch of \( \Theta_v \). We can easily read off the numerical condition from this by writing \( \tau_{v,s}(m,c,d,e) \) at \( \alpha = 0 \) as

\[
6v_3 - \frac{6v_1v_2}{v_0} + \frac{2v_1^3}{v_0} + \left( \beta - \frac{v_1}{v_0} \right) \left( \frac{3v_1^2}{v_0} - 6v_2 \right) - v_0 \left( \beta - \frac{v_1}{v_0} \right)^3
\]

\( \Box \)

Figure 2. This graph contains an example of the situation described in Proposition 3.6 for \( v = (3, 4, 2, 2/3) \), which is the Chern character of the tangent bundle of \( P^3 \). We set \( s = 1/3 \). The curve \( \Gamma_{v,s} \) (in red) intersects the left branch of the hyperbola \( \Theta_v \) (in blue) at the point \( (\alpha, \beta) \approx (0.27, 0.62) \). In addition, \( \Gamma^0_{v,s} \) is asymptotic to the vertical line \( \{ \beta = \mu(v) \} \), while the component \( \Gamma^+_{v,s} \) does not intersect \( \Theta^+_v \). We also illustrate Theorem 4.22 here, with the vanishing \( \nu \)- and \( \lambda \)-walls represented by the curves \( \Xi_{u,v} \) (in magenta) and \( \Upsilon_{u,v,s} \) (in black), respectively, where \( u = \text{ch}(\mathcal{O}_{P^3}(1)) \). Finally, Lemma 4.5 is also represented, since both of these walls cross \( \Theta^-_v \) at the same point.

The following is an easy exercise.

Proposition 3.7. The quartic form \( q \) in equation (23) is invariant under \( E \mapsto E \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(k) \) and \( E \mapsto E^\vee \).

4. Walls

4.1. \( \nu \)-walls. Given in a real numerical Chern character \( v \), a curve \( \Xi_{u,v} \subset \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R} \) is called a numerical \( \nu \)-wall for \( v \) if there is a real numerical Chern character \( u \) such that

\[
\Xi_{u,v} := \{ t_{u,v}(\alpha, \beta) = 0 \}, \quad \text{where}
\]

\[
t_{u,v}(\alpha, \beta) := \rho_u(\alpha, \beta) \text{ch}_1^2(v) - \rho_v(\alpha, \beta) \text{ch}_1^2(u) = \Delta_{21}(\alpha, \beta),
\]
compare with the notation introduced in display (11). Note that this coincides with the numerator of the difference \( \nu_{\alpha,\beta}(u) - \nu_{\alpha,\beta}(v) \), so its vanishing locus is precisely where it changes sign. Observe that numerical \( \nu \)-walls are invariant as subsets of the upper half plane under the changes of coordinates \( u \mapsto \kappa v + u \), \( u \mapsto \zeta u \) and \((u,v) \mapsto (v,u)\) for any real constants \( \kappa \) and \( \zeta \neq 0 \).

**Lemma 4.1.** Suppose that \( \nu_0 > 0 \), \( \nu \) satisfies the Bogomolov inequality and \( u = (0,1,x,y) \) for real \( x \) and \( y \). Then the following are equivalent

1. \( \Xi_{u,v} \) is empty.
2. for all real \( \kappa \), \( \kappa v + u \) satisfies the Bogomolov inequality.
3. \( (x - \mu(v))^2 \leq \mu(v)^2 - 2v_2/v_0 \).
4. \( \delta_{02}(u,v)^2 \leq 4\delta_{01}(u,v)\delta_{12}(u,v) \).

**Proof.** The condition in (3) is the discriminant condition for (2) which is a quadratic condition on \( \lambda \) and it happens to be the same as the quadratic condition for \( t_{u,v}(\alpha,\beta) = 0 \) to have solutions.

The structure of numerical \( \nu \)-walls was described in [20] for the case of projective surfaces, but the same results also hold for projective 3-folds, see for instance [33, Theorem 3.3] and [24, Remark 9.2]. Precisely, numerical \( \nu \)-walls are non-intersecting semicircles centered along the horizontal axis, and cross the hyperbola \( \Theta_\nu \) at their maximum point. The semicircles tend to a fixed point \((C_0,0)\) on the \( \beta \)-axis as the radius tends to zero.

**Definition 4.2.** A numerical \( \nu \)-wall \( \Xi_{u,v} \) is called an *actual \( \nu \)-wall* if for some \((\alpha_0,\beta_0) \in \Xi_{u,v}\) there is an object \( B \in \mathcal{B}^{3\nu} \) with \( \text{ch}(B) = v \) and a \( \nu_{\alpha_0,\beta_0} \)-semistable sub-object \( F \hookrightarrow B \) with \( \text{ch}(F) = u \) such that the quotient \( E/F \) is also \( \nu_{\alpha_0,\beta_0} \)-semistable.

It then follows that the same property holds for every point of \( \Xi_{u,v} \), see [33, Theorem 3.3]. Actual \( \nu \)-walls are *locally finite* (that is, any compact subset of the upper half plane intersects only finitely many numerical \( \nu \)-walls), see [24, Lemma 6.23], and there are \( C_{\text{max}} \in \mathbb{R} \) and \( R_{\text{max}} > 0 \) such that every numerical \( \nu \)-wall is contained in the semicircle centered at \((C_{\text{max}},0)\) with radius \( R_{\text{max}} \). In particular, there is \( \overline{\nu} > 0 \) for which there are only finitely many actual \( \nu \)-walls above the horizontal line \( \{\alpha = \overline{\nu}\} \). However, actual \( \nu \)-walls may accumulate towards the point \( \Theta_\nu \cap \{\alpha = 0\} \), see [27] and [39] for examples on abelian surfaces.

Another observation is that, since \( \nu \)-walls are nested, there can be at most two vanishing \( \nu \)-walls for a given Chern character \( v \), one on each side of the vertical line \( \{\beta = \mu(v)\} \).

Combining Lemma 4.1 with Proposition 2.12 we can deduce the following technical result that will be useful later on. For a Chern character \( v \), we let

\[ Y_v = \{ \gamma \mid \gamma = \delta_{02}(u,v)/\delta_{01}(u,v) \text{ for some actual } \nu \text{-wall given by } u \} \]

Then we have:

**Proposition 4.3.** Suppose \( \text{ch}(E) = v = (a,b,c/2,d/6) \) and \( \text{ch}(F) = u = (r,x,y/2,z/6) \) are two numerical Chern characters which satisfy the Bogomolov inequality, \( a > 0 \) and \( \delta_{01}(u,v) \neq 0 \). If \( F \hookrightarrow E \rightarrow G \) is a short exact sequence in \( \mathcal{B}^{3\nu} \) for \( \beta < \mu(E) \) then if \( \delta_{02}(u,v)/\delta_{01}(u,v) \notin Y_v \),

\[
\delta_{01}(u,v)\delta_{12}(u,v) \geq 0 \text{ and } |\delta_{02}(u,v)| \leq 2\sqrt{\delta_{01}(u,v)\delta_{12}(u,v)}.
\]
4.2. \(\lambda\)-walls. Given in a real numerical Chern character \(v\), a curve \(\Upsilon_{u,v,s} \subset \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}\) is called a numerical \(\lambda\)-wall for \(v\) if there is a real numerical Chern character \(u\) such that

\[
\Upsilon_{u,v,s} := \{f_{u,v,s}(\alpha, \beta) = 0\},
\]

where

\[
f_{u,v,s}(\alpha, \beta) := \tau_{u,s}(\alpha, \beta)\rho_v(\alpha, \beta) - \tau_{v,s}(\alpha, \beta)\rho_u(\alpha, \beta).
\]

Note that this coincides with the numerator of the difference \(\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}(u) - \lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}(v)\), so its vanishing locus is precisely where this difference changes sign. Comparing with the notation introduced in display (11), we remark that

\[
f_{u,v,s}(\alpha, \beta) = \Delta_{32} - \alpha^2(s - 1/3)\Delta_{21}
\]

thus, in particular, \(f_{u,v,1/3}(\alpha, \beta) = \Delta_{32}(\alpha, \beta)\).

More explicitly, using the notation from display (11)

\[
\delta_{ij} = \delta_{ij}(u, v) = \text{ch}_1(u)\text{ch}_j(v) - \text{ch}_i(u)\text{ch}_j(v),
\]

we have:

\[
f_{u,v,s}(\alpha, \beta) = \frac{6s + 1}{12}\delta_{10}\alpha^4 + \left(\frac{3s - 1}{6}\delta_{10}\beta^2 - 3s - 1\delta_{20}\beta + \frac{6s + 1}{6}\delta_{21} - \frac{1}{2}\delta_{30}\right)\alpha^2 + \left(\frac{1}{12}\delta_{10}\beta^4 - \frac{1}{3}\delta_{20}\beta^3 + (\delta_{30} + \delta_{21})\beta^2 - \delta_{31}\beta + \delta_{32}\right).
\]

Numerical \(\lambda\)-walls that are bounded as subsets of \(\mathbb{H}\) have a simple numerical characterization.

**Proposition 4.4.** Let \(v\) be a real numerical Chern character with \(v_0 \neq 0\) and satisfying the Bogomolov inequality. A numerical \(\lambda\)-wall \(\Upsilon_{u,v,s}\) for \(v\) is bounded if and only if \(\delta_{10}(u, v) \neq 0\).

Notice that if \(\Upsilon_{u,v,s}\) is bounded for some value of the parameter \(s\), then it is bounded for every value of \(s\).

**Proof.** Assuming \(\delta_{10}(u, v) \neq 0\), turn \(f_{u,v,s}(\alpha, \beta)\) into a homogeneous polynomial of degree 4 by adding a new variable \(\gamma\); let us denote this new function by \(\overline{f}_{u,v,s}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)\). The set \(\{\overline{f}_{u,v,s}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = 0\}\) can be regarded as a hypersurface in \(\mathbb{RP}^2\), and \(\Upsilon_{u,v,s}\) is bounded if and only if \(\{\overline{f}_{u,v,s}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = 0\}\) does not intersect the line at infinity \(\{\gamma = 0\}\).

Comparing with equation (27), note that

\[
\overline{f}_{u,v,s}(\alpha, \beta, 0) = \frac{\delta_{10}}{12} (6s\alpha^2 + \beta^2) + (\alpha^2 - \beta^2)^2.
\]

Since the right hand side vanishes if and only if \(\alpha = \beta = 0\), we conclude that \(\{\overline{f}_{u,v,s}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = 0\}\) does not intersect the line at infinity \(\{\gamma = 0\}\), hence \(\Upsilon_{u,v,s}\) is bounded.

Next, if \(\delta_{10}(u, v) = 0\) and \(\delta_{20}(u, v) \neq 0\), then the homogenisation of \(f_{u,v,s}(\alpha, \beta)\) yields a polynomial \(\overline{f}_{u,v,s}(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)\) of degree 3. Comparing with equation (27), note that

\[
\overline{f}_{u,v,s}(\alpha, \beta, 0) = -\frac{\delta_{20}}{3} ((3s - 1)\alpha^2 + \beta^2)\beta,
\]

so \(\overline{f}_{u,v,s}(1, 0, 0) = 0\), thus \(\Upsilon_{u,v,s}\) is not bounded.
Finally, if $\delta_{10}(u,v) = \delta_{20}(u,v) = 0$ also, then $f_{u,v,s}(\alpha, \beta)$ becomes a constant multiple of $\rho_u(\alpha, \beta) = \rho_v(\alpha, \beta)$, hence the curve $\Upsilon_{u,v,s}$ coincides with the hyperbola $\Theta_V$ which is not bounded. \qed

Let us now analyse unbounded numerical $\lambda$-walls. Note that if $\delta_{10}(u,v) = 0$, then the expression in equation (27) reduces to a cubic polynomial in $\beta$, with coefficients depending on $\alpha$, so it always has a real root; in other words, unbounded numerical $\lambda$-walls intersect every horizontal line. Furthermore, unbounded numerical $\lambda$-walls with different values of the parameter $s$ can look very different, see Figure 3; in particular an unbounded numerical $\lambda$-wall might not be connected.

Figure 3. The numerical $\lambda$-wall $\Upsilon_{u,v,s}$ for $v = (2, 0, -3, 0)$ and $u = (0, 0, -1, 1)$ is plotted for $s = 0.01$ (red curve), which has two separate connected components, and for $s = 2.5$ (purple curve), which has a single connected component. Both curves are asymptotic to the vertical line $\{\beta = \mu(v) = 0\}$, while the red curve is also asymptotic both branches of $\Theta_v$ (in blue).

Next, we observe an interesting relation between a numerical $\lambda$-wall $\Upsilon_{u,v,s}$ and its the associated numerical $\nu$-wall $\Xi_{u,v}$: if one intersects the hyperbola $\Theta_v$, then so does the other.

**Lemma 4.5.** Let $v$ be a real numerical Chern character satisfying the Bogomolov inequality and $\nu_0 \neq 0$. If a numerical $\lambda$-wall $\Upsilon_{u,v}$ intersects $\Theta_v$ at a point $(\alpha_0, \beta_0)$ for which an object $A$ with $\text{ch}(A) = v$ exists in $A^{\alpha_0, \beta_0}$, then the associated numerical $\nu$-wall $\Xi_{u,v}$ also passes through $(\alpha_0, \beta_0)$.

Conversely, if a numerical $\nu$-wall $\Xi_{u,v}$ intersects $\Theta_v$ at a point $(\alpha_0, \beta_0)$, then the associated numerical $\lambda$-wall $\Upsilon_{u,v,s}$ also passes through $(\alpha_0, \beta_0)$.

**Proof.** Since $\rho_v(\alpha_0, \beta_0) = 0$, we have $\rho_u(\alpha_0, \beta_0)\tau_{v,s}(\alpha_0, \beta_0) = 0$. However, Lemma 2.3 guarantees that $\tau_{v,s}(\alpha_0, \beta_0) > 0$ for every $s$, thus $\rho_u(\alpha_0, \beta_0) = 0$. It follows that $t_{u,v}(\alpha_0, \beta_0) = 0$, as desired.

For the second statement, if $t_{u,v}(\alpha_0, \beta_0) = \rho_v(\alpha_0, \beta_0) = 0$, then also $\rho_u(\alpha_0, \beta_0) = 0$ because $\text{ch}_1^{\beta_0}(v) \neq 0$, thus $f_{u,v}(\alpha_0, \beta_0) = 0$. \qed
Lemma 4.6. If the curves $\Theta_u$ and $\Gamma_{v,s}$ intersect, then every numerical $\lambda$-wall for $v$ passes through the point of intersection.

Proof. Let $(\alpha_0, \beta_0)$ be the point of intersection, so that $\rho_v(\alpha_0, \beta_0) = \tau_{v,s}(\alpha_0, \beta_0) = 0$. By the expression in display (26), it follows that $f_{u,v,s}(\alpha_0, \beta_0) = 0$, for every real numerical Chern character $u$ and every $s > 0$. \qed

Unbounded numerical $\lambda$-walls are trickier to describe, as their qualitative behaviour is highly dependent on the value of the parameter $s$, as illustrated in Figure 3 above. Their main properties are described in the following series of lemmas. First, we consider the case $s > 1/3$.

Lemma 4.7. Let $s > 1/3$. If $u$ and $v$ are real numerical Chern characters satisfying $\delta_{10}(u,v) = 0$ and $\delta_{20}(u,v) \neq 0$, then there exists $\beta_{\text{max}} > 0$ (depending on $u$, $v$ and $s$) such that $\Upsilon_{u,v,s} \subset \mathbb{R}^+ \times [-\beta_{\text{max}}, \beta_{\text{max}}]$. \[ \frac{\beta^3 + \cdots}{a_0} \]

Proof. If $\delta_{10} = 0$, then equation (27) reduces, after dividing by $\delta_{20}$, to

\[ (s - 1/3)\beta + \cdots \alpha^2 + (\beta^3 + \cdots) = 0, \]

If $s > 1/3$ and either $\beta < 0$ or $\beta > 0$, both coefficients $a_2$ and $a_0$ in equation (29) have the same sign, hence equation (29) does not admit any solutions. \qed

Lemma 4.8. Let $s \neq 1/3$. If $u$ and $v$ are real numerical Chern characters satisfying $\delta_{10}(u,v) = 0$ and $\delta_{20}(u,v) \neq 0$, then one of the connected components of $\Upsilon_{u,v,s}$ is asymptotic to the vertical line $\{ \beta = \beta' \}$, where

\[ \beta' := \frac{3}{(6s - 2)\delta_{20}(u,v)} \left( \frac{6s + 1}{3} \delta_{21}(u,v) - \delta_{30}(u,v) \right). \]

Proof. If $s \neq 1/3$, then the equation $f_{u,v}(\alpha, \beta) = 0$ can be rewritten in the following way:

\[ \alpha^2 = \frac{1}{3} \delta_{20} \beta^3 - (\delta_{30} + \delta_{21}) \beta^2 + \delta_{31} \beta - \delta_{32} - \frac{3s - 1}{3} \delta_{20} \beta + \frac{6s + 1}{6} \delta_{21} - \frac{1}{2} \delta_{30}. \]

Note that the denominator vanishes at $\beta = \beta'$ given above; therefore $\alpha$ goes to infinity as $\beta$ approaches $\beta'$. \qed

Lemma 4.9. Let $s \leq 1/3$. If $u$ and $v$ are numerical Chern characters satisfying $\delta_{10}(u,v) = 0$ and $\delta_{20}(u,v) \neq 0$, then there exist $\alpha_{\text{max}} > 0$ (depending on $u$, $v$ and $s$) such that

\[ \Upsilon_{u,v,s} \cap \{ (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R} \mid \alpha > \alpha_{\text{max}} \} \subset \{ (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R} \mid \rho_v(\alpha, \beta) < 0 \}. \]

Proof. If $s < 1/3$, then equation (29) does admit solutions, which are asymptotically of the form

\[ \alpha \sqrt{1/3 - s} = \pm (\beta - \beta'), \]

for some $\beta' \in \mathbb{R}$ given explicitly in Lemma 4.8 above. In other words, there is $\alpha_{\text{max}} > 0$ such that $\Upsilon_{u,v,s} \cap \{ (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R} \mid \alpha > \alpha_{\text{max}} \} \subset \mathbb{R}^0$.

If $s = 1/3$ and $\delta_{21} - \delta_{30} \neq 0$, then equation $f_{u,v,s}(\alpha, \beta) = 0$ reduces to

\[ \alpha^2 + \frac{2}{3} \frac{\delta_{20}}{\delta_{21} - \delta_{30}} \beta^3 + \cdots = 0. \]
Depending on the sign of \( \delta_{20}/(\delta_{21} - \delta_{30}) \), such equation does admit solutions either for \( \beta \ll 0 \) or for \( \beta \gg 0 \); in both cases, \( \alpha \) grows like \( |\beta|^{3/2} \), so \( \Upsilon_{u,v,s} \) will lie in the region \( R^0_v \) once \( \alpha \) is sufficiently large. The same conclusion holds when \( \delta_{30} = \delta_{21} \), since then \( f_{u,v,s}(\alpha,\beta) \) becomes just a cubic polynomial on \( \beta \), not depending on \( \alpha \). \( \square \)

**Remark 4.10.** Note that there are no \( \nu \)-walls corresponding to unbounded \( \lambda \)-walls and so by continuity the unbounded component remains in \( R^0_v \) as it cannot intersect \( \Theta_v \).

However, an unbounded \( \lambda \)-wall for \( v \) may have a bounded connected component contained in \( R^-_v \), as pictured in Figure 4 below.

**Figure 4.** The numerical \( \lambda \)-wall \( \Upsilon_{u,v,s} \) for \( v = (2,0,-1,0) \) and \( u = (1,0,-1,1) \), so that \( \delta_{01}(u,v) = 0 \), is plotted for \( s = 1/3 \) (black curve). It has two connected components: one is bounded, and fully contained in \( R^0_v \); the other is unbounded, and fully contained in \( R^0_v \). The bounded component crosses \( \Gamma^-_{v,s} \). The curve \( \Theta_v \) and the other connected components of \( \Gamma_{v,s} \), namely \( \Gamma^0_{v,s} \) and \( \Gamma^+_{v,s} \), are also shown, with the former coinciding with the \( \alpha \)-axis.

We now show that intersection between numerical \( \lambda \)-walls and the curve \( \Gamma_{v,s} \) is independent of \( s \).

**Lemma 4.11.** If a numerical \( \lambda \)-wall \( \Upsilon_{u,v,\tau} \) crosses \( \Gamma_{v,\tau} \) for some \( \tau \geq 0 \) away from \( \Theta_v \), then \( \Upsilon_{u,v,s} \) crosses \( \Gamma_{v,s} \) for every \( s \geq 0 \) at points whose \( \beta \)-coordinate does not depend on \( s \).

**Proof.** Assume that \((\alpha_0, \beta_0) \in \mathbb{H} \) satisfies \( f_{u,v,\tau}(\alpha_0, \beta_0) = \tau_{v,\tau}(\alpha_0, \beta_0) = 0 \) and we also assume that \( \rho_v(\alpha_0, \beta_0) \neq 0 \); in other words, \((\alpha_0, \beta_0) \in \nu_{u,v,\tau} \cap \Gamma_{v,\tau} \) lies away from the hyperbola \( \Theta_v \). It follows that \( \tau_{u,\tau}(\alpha_0, \beta_0) = 0 \), i.e. the curve \( \Gamma_{u,s} \) also passes through \((\alpha_0, \beta_0) \), so that
\[
\text{ch}_3^{\beta_0}(u) = \left( \tau + \frac{1}{6} \right) \text{ch}_1^{\beta_0}(u) \alpha_0^2.
\]
Since \( \tau_{v,\tau}(\alpha_0, \beta_0) = 0 \) as well, we conclude that
\[
\frac{\text{ch}_3^{\beta_0}(u)}{\text{ch}_1^{2\beta_0}(u)} = \frac{\text{ch}_3^{\beta_0}(v)}{\text{ch}_1^{2\beta_0}(v)} = \left( \tau + \frac{1}{6} \right) \alpha_0^2.
\]
For any \( s \geq 0 \), there is an \( \alpha_s \) such that \( (s + 1/6)\alpha_s^2 = (s + 1/6)\alpha_0^2 \); substituting back into equation (30), we conclude that \( \tau_{u,s}(\alpha_s, \beta_0) = \tau_{v,s}(\alpha_s, \beta_0) = 0 \), thus
Given \( v \in K_{\text{num}}(X) \), we define an equivalence relation in \( K_{\text{num}}(X) \) as follows:

\[
(31) \quad u \sim u' \text{ if there exists real numbers } \psi \neq 0 \text{ and } \phi \text{ such that } u' = \phi v + \psi u.
\]

Note that \( u \sim u' \) implies \( \delta_{ij}(u', v) = \psi \delta_{ij}(u, v) \) and thus \( Y_{u,v,s} = Y_{u',v,s} \). In other words, the set of numerical \( \lambda \)-walls for a fixed \( v \in K_{\text{num}}(X) \) only depend on the equivalence class under \( \sim_v \).

**Lemma 4.12.** Suppose \( u \) and \( v \) are real numerical Chern characters and \( v_0 \neq 0 \). Then:

1. \( u \sim_v (0, 1, \delta_{02}(u, v)/\delta_{01}(u, v), \delta_{03}(u, v)/\delta_{01}(u, v)) \) if \( \delta_{01}(u, v) \neq 0 \) and \( \delta_{02}(u, v) \neq 0 \) and \( \delta_{03}(u, v) \neq 0 \).
2. \( u \sim_v (0, 0, 1, \delta_{03}(u, v)/\delta_{02}(u, v)) \) if \( \delta_{01}(u, v) = 0 \) and \( \delta_{02}(u, v) \neq 0 \) and \( \delta_{03}(u, v) \neq 0 \).

**Proof.** If \( \delta_{01}(u, v) \neq 0 \) take \( \phi = u_0/\delta_{01}(u, v) \) and \( \psi = -v_0/\delta_{01}(u, v) \). If \( \delta_{01}(u, v) = 0 \), take \( \phi = u_0/\delta_{02}(u, v) \) and \( \psi = -v_0/\delta_{02}(u, v) \). □

It follows that equivalence classes for \( \sim_v \) come in three types when \( v_0 \neq 0 \), according to Table 1 below (\( x \) and \( y \) are arbitrary rational numbers). In the degenerate case, the numerical \( \lambda \)-wall \( Y_{u,v,s} \) coincides with \( \Theta_v \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Characterization</th>
<th>Canonical element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bounded</td>
<td>( \delta_{01} \neq 0 )</td>
<td>(0,1,x,y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unbounded</td>
<td>( \delta_{01} = 0, \delta_{02} \neq 0 )</td>
<td>(0,0,1,x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degenerate</td>
<td>( \delta_{01} = \delta_{02} = 0, \delta_{03} \neq 0 )</td>
<td>(0,0,0,1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Equivalence classes \( \sim_v \) when \( v_0 \neq 0 \).

This gives us a quick way to see that various families of numerical \( \lambda \)-walls do not intersect each other, and it provides a form of Bertram’s Nested Wall Theorem.

**Theorem 4.13.** Suppose \( v_0 \neq 0 \) and \( u \not\sim_v u' \).

1. The numerical \( v \)-walls corresponding to \( u \) and \( u' \) do not intersect.
2. If \( \delta_{01}(u, v) = 0 = \delta_{01}(u', v) \) then the numerical \( \lambda \)-walls corresponding to \( u \) and \( u' \) do not intersect.
3. If \( \delta_{01}(u, v) \neq 0 \) and \( \chi_{\leq 2}(u) = \chi_{\leq 2}(u') \), then the numerical \( \lambda \)-walls corresponding for \( v \) to \( u \) and \( u' \) only intersect on \( \Theta_v \).

**Proof.** We do (3) and leave (1) and (2) as similar exercises. We simply observe that the equation for the numerical \( \lambda \)-wall \( Y_{u,v,s} \) can be written in the following manner

\[
u_3 \rho_v(\alpha, \beta) = g(\alpha, \beta, v, \chi_{\leq 2}(u)),
\]

for some function \( g \). Hence, if \( (\alpha, \beta) \) is not on \( \Theta_v \) but lies on \( Y_{u,v,s} \cap Y_{u',v,s} \), then we must have \( u_3 = \chi_3(u') \). □

We conclude that distinct unbounded numerical \( \lambda \)-walls never intersect one another. On the other hand, it is interesting to observe that, in contrast with numerical \( v \)-walls, two distinct bounded numerical \( \lambda \)-walls for \( Y_{u,v,s} \) and \( Y_{u',v,s} \) can intersect both along \( \Theta_v \) (if \( \chi_{\leq 2}(u) = \chi_{\leq 2}(u') \)), as illustrated in item (3) of Theorem 4.13 and away from it, see Figure 5.

Our normal form for \( u \) can also be used to give sufficient conditions for when a numerical wall for \( v \) intersects \( \Gamma_{v,s} \):
Figure 5. The numerical λ-walls Υ_{u,v,s} and Υ_{u',v,s} for v = (2, 0, −3, 0) with u = (1, −1, 1/2, −1/6) and u' = (1, −2, 2, −4/3) are plotted for s = 1/3; they cross at the point (∈ 0.5, β = −1.48). The curves Γ_{v,1/3} (in red) and Θ_v (in blue) are also shown.

Proposition 4.14. Let u and v be real numerical Chern characters such that v satisfies the Bogomolov inequality, ch_0(v) \neq 0 and δ_{01}(u, v) \neq 0. If δ_{01}(u, v)\delta_{03}(u, v) \geq \delta_{02}(u, v)^2/2 then the numerical λ-wall Υ_{u,v,s} intersects Γ_{0,v,s}. If δ_{01}(u, v)\delta_{03}(u, v) \leq \delta_{02}(u, v)^2/2 then, Υ_{u,v,s} intersects both Γ_{v,s} and Γ_{v,s}.

Proof. Writing u in the canonical form (0, 1, x, y) observe that Γ_u,s is given by the hyperbola:

(β − x)^2/2 − α^2(s + 1/6) = x^2/2 − y.

The conditions in the statement about δ_{ij} are equivalent to the hyperbola crossing the β-axis or not. The hyperbolae are asymptotic to β = x ± √(2(s + 1/6)α) while Γ_{v,s} is either asymptotic to β = μ or to β = μ ± √(6(s + 1/6)α). Then the hypotheses guarantee that Γ_u,s and Γ_{v,s} intersect as stated. □

Remark 4.15. Observe that an unbounded numerical λ-wall Υ_{u,v,s} associated to u \sim_v (0, 0, 1, x) intersects Γ_{v,s} (necessarily away from Θ_v, since unbounded λ-walls for v never cross Θ_v) at a point with coordinates (α, β) for some uniquely determined α so long as x is the β coordinate of some point on Γ_{v,s}. Since the wall Υ_{u,v,s} can only cross Θ_v, at its intersection with Γ_{v,s} and its asymptotes are in \mathbb{R}_{0}^v, it follows that, for |x| sufficiently large, there is a component of the wall which is bounded and which intersects Γ_{v,s}.

4.3. Actual, pseudo and vanishing λ-walls.

Definition 4.16. An actual λ-wall W_{u,v,s} is the subset of points (α, β) of a numerical λ-wall Υ_{u,v,s} for which there is an object E ∈ A^{α,β} with ch(E) = v and a path γ : (−1, 1) → \mathbb{R}_{>0} × \mathbb{R} such that γ(0) = (α, β) and E ∈ A^{γ(t)} is λ-stable for t < 0 and λ-unstable for t > 0.

This is a rather stronger condition than the usual one, which asks simply that A is properly λ_{α,β,s}-semistable at the point (α, β). Our definition ensures that actual λ-walls are one-dimensional and avoids degenerate situations like the one described in Remark 2.6. In addition, it allows us to state:
Lemma 4.17. An actual $\lambda$-wall $W_{u,v,s}$ is a union of segments of arc within the underlying numerical $\lambda$-wall $\Upsilon_{u,v,s}$ whose endpoints lie either on another actual $\lambda$-wall for $u$ or $v$, or on the $\beta$-axis.

Proof. Assume first that $p \in W_{u,v,s}$ is an isolated point, that is, there exists an open neighbourhood $B$ of $p$ on which there are no other actual $\lambda$-walls. In contrast with the path $\gamma$ going through $p$ along which the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{\gamma(t),s}(v)$ changes as explained above, one can find a path $\gamma^\prime : [0,1] \to B$ such that $\gamma^\prime(0) = \gamma(0)$ and $\gamma^\prime(1) = \gamma(1)$ which does not cross any actual $\lambda$-wall, implying that $\mathcal{M}_{\gamma^\prime(0),s}(v) = \mathcal{M}_{\gamma(1),s}(v)$, and thus providing a contradiction.

It follows that $W_{u,v,s}$ is a union of segments of arc within $\Upsilon_{u,v,s}$. If one of the endpoints of these intervals, call it $e$, is not as claimed, then again one can find a path within a sufficiently small open neighbourhood of $e$ which either goes around $W_{u,v,s}$, if $e \in W_{u,v,s}$, or goes through $e$, if $e \notin W_{u,v,s}$, without crossing any actual $\lambda$-wall, and thus contradicting the existence of nearby paths that do cross $W_{u,v,s}$.

In another direction, if an object is strictly destabilized along a curve then it can only become stable if either the curve crosses an actual $\lambda$-wall or a $\Theta$ curve. Note that if an actual $\lambda$-wall $W_{u,v}$ crosses $\Theta_u$ then it must also cross $\Theta_v$.

Proposition 4.18. Fix $s > 0$. Suppose $\gamma : (-a, b) \to \mathbb{H}$ is a curve for some $a, b > 0$ and $A \in \mathcal{A}^{(t)}$ for all $-a < t < b$. Suppose $B \hookrightarrow A \to C$ is a destabilizing sequence for $-a < t < 0$.

1. If $A$ is not $\lambda_{\gamma(t),s}$-semistable for $0 < t < b$ then there exists $\epsilon, \epsilon^\prime > 0$ and some destabilizing sequence $K \hookrightarrow A \to Q$ defined for all $-\epsilon^\prime < t < \epsilon$ with $\lambda_{\gamma(t),s}(K) \geq \lambda_{\gamma(t),s}(B)$, respectively $\lambda_{\gamma(t),s}(Q) \leq \lambda_{\gamma(t),s}(C)$ with equalities if and only if $C = Q$, respectively $B = K$.

2. If $A$ is $\lambda_{\gamma(t),s}$-stable for $0 < t < b$ then there is an actual $\lambda$-wall corresponding to $B$ containing $\gamma(0)$.

Proof. In either case, we have a long exact sequence for $0 < t < \epsilon$ in $\mathcal{A}^{(t)}$:

$$0 \to C^{-1} \to B^0 \to A \to C^0 \to B^1 \to 0.$$ 

This is because as we cross $t = 0$ the phase changes continuously and the $\mathcal{A}^{(t)}$-cohomology of any object in $\mathcal{A}^{(t)}$ for $-\epsilon^\prime < t < 0$ in nearby $\gamma(t)$ is concentrated in positions $-1, 0$ and/or 1. Split the sequence via $B^0 \to K \to A \to Q \to C^0$ and note that, for $-1 < t < 0$, $C^{-1}[1], B^1[-1] \in \mathcal{A}^{(t)}$ and $\lim_{t \to 0} \lambda_{\gamma(t),s}(C^{-1}[1]) = +\infty$ and $\lim_{t \to 0} \lambda_{\gamma(t),s}(B^1[-1]) = -\infty$. We also have short exact sequences for $-1 \ll t < 0$:

$$C^{-1}[1] \to C \to C^0$$

and $B^0 \to B \to B^1[-1]$.

It follows that $K \to A \to Q$ is short exact in $\mathcal{A}^{(t)}$ for $-\epsilon < t < \epsilon$ and that, for $-1 < t < 0$, $\lambda_{\gamma(t),s}(K) \geq \lambda_{\gamma(t),s}(B)$ with equality only if $C^{-1} = 0$. Similarly, $\lambda_{\gamma(t),s}(Q) \leq \lambda_{\gamma(t),s}(C)$ with equality only if $B^1 = 0$.

If $A$ is $\lambda_{\gamma(t),s}$-stable beyond $t = 0$ then we must have equality in one of these. If it is both then the $B \to A \to C$ provides an actual wall at $\gamma(0)$. If only one is equality then $\gamma(0) \in \Theta_u$ where $u = \text{ch}(B)$ or $u = \text{ch}(C)$. But then, $\lambda_{\gamma(0),s}(A) = +\infty$ and so $\gamma(0) \in \Theta_{\text{ch}(A)}$ as well and so, again, this sequence provides an actual $\lambda$-wall.

If our aim is to find all actual $\lambda$-walls then it is easier to first consider a list of necessary numerical conditions in order to reduce the possibilities to a small list of
examples (this is exactly what we will do in the example presented in Proposition \ref{8.11} below).

**Definition 4.19.** By a pseudo \(\lambda\)-wall \(W_{u,v,s}\) we mean the subset of points \((\alpha, \beta)\) of a numerical \(\lambda\)-wall \(Y_{u,v,s}\) for which

1. there are objects \(E, F, G \in \mathcal{A}^{\alpha, \beta}\) satisfying \(\text{ch}(E) = v, \text{ch}(F) = u, \text{ch}(G) = v - u\);
2. \(Q^{\text{tilt}}(u) \geq 0, Q^{\text{tilt}}(v - u) \geq 0;\)
3. \(Q_{\alpha, \beta}(u) \geq 0, Q_{\alpha, \beta}(v - u) \geq 0.\)

The support property, see Proposition \ref{2.4}, implies that an actual \(\lambda\)-wall is also a pseudo \(\lambda\)-wall.

**Remark 4.20.** In practice, we would start by replacing (1) with the necessary conditions that \(u \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2 \times \mathbb{Z}/6\) and \(\gamma(u) \in \mathbb{Z}\).

Unlike actual \(\nu\)-walls, distinct actual \(\lambda\)-walls for a given Chern character \(v\) do intersect. This was first noticed by Schmidt in \cite{schmidt}, where he establishes a refinement of Lemma \ref{4.5}, providing a relationship between actual \(\nu\)- and \(\lambda\)-walls for \(v\) along \(\Theta_v\); more precisely, he proves the following statement.

**Theorem 4.21.** \cite{schmidt} Thm. 6.1] Let \(v\) be a Chern character satisfying the Bogomolov inequality and \(v_0 \neq 0\), and let \((\alpha_0, \beta_0)\) be a point \(\Theta_v\).

- If there is an actual \(\lambda\)-wall for \(v\) containing \((\alpha_0, \beta_0)\) given by the exact sequence \(0 \to F \to A \to G \to 0\) in \(\mathcal{A}^{\alpha_0, \beta_0}\), then there is an actual \(\nu\)-wall containing \((\alpha_0, \beta_0)\) given by the exact sequence \(0 \to F[-1] \to A[-1] \to G[-1] \to 0\) in \(\mathcal{B}^{\beta_0}\).

- Conversely, if there is an actual \(\nu\)-wall for \(v\) containing \((\alpha_0, \beta_0)\) given by the sequence \(0 \to F \to A \to G \to 0\) in \(\mathcal{B}^{\beta_0}\), then there is an actual \(\lambda\)-wall for \(v\) which is defined by the same sequence in \(\mathcal{A}^{\alpha_0, \beta_0}\).

We also provide a concrete example of two distinct actual \(\lambda\)-walls for the Chern character \(v := (2, 0, -1, 0)\) which intersect away from \(\Theta_v\) in Section \ref{8.4} below.

Furthermore, an actual \(\lambda\)-wall \(W_{u,v,s}\) is called a vanishing \(\lambda\)-wall for \(v\) if for each \(p \in W_{u,v,s}\) there exists a path \(\gamma : (-1, 1) \to \mathbb{H}\) crossing \(W_{u,v,s}\) transversely at \(\gamma(0) = p\) for some \(w \in (0, 1)\) such that \(\mathcal{M}_{\gamma(t),s}(v) \neq 0\) for \(t < 0\), while \(\mathcal{M}_{\gamma(t),s}(v) = 0\) and \(t > 0\).

The meaning of the quartic function \(q(v)\) on \(K_{\text{num}}(X)\) defined in equation (23) can now be expressed in the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.22.** Let \(v\) be a Chern character for which there exists a Gieseker semistable sheaf \(E\) with \(\text{ch}(E) = v\). If \(q(v) < 0\) then there must exist vanishing \(\nu\)- and \(\lambda\)-walls for \(v\).

**Proof.** Since \(E\) is Gieseker semistable, \(v\) satisfies the Bogomolov inequality and so the curve \(\Theta_v\) divides the plane into three regions, as explained in Section \ref{8.3} above.

If \(q(E) < 0\), then there is \(\alpha_0 > 0\) such that \(\Gamma_{v,s} \cap \{\alpha = \alpha_0\}\) consists of a single point, thus either the asymptotic components \(\Gamma_{v,s}^-\) and \(\Gamma_{v,s}^0\) or \(\Gamma_{v,s}^+\) and \(\Gamma_{v,s}^0\) must belong to the same connected component of \(\Gamma_{v,s}\), which must then cross the hyperbola \(\Theta_v\).

Since Proposition \ref{2.3} fails for \((\alpha, \beta) \in \Theta_v\) below the point of intersection \((\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}) := \Gamma_{v,s} \cap \Theta_v\), there can not exist any objects with Chern character equal to \(v\) in \(\mathcal{A}^{\alpha, \beta}(X)\) for \((\alpha, \beta) \in \Theta_v\) with \(\alpha \leq \tilde{\alpha}\).
5. Asymptotic $\nu,\beta$-stability

One of the main goals of this paper is to characterize which objects in $D^b(X)$ are $\nu,\beta$-stable and $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-semistable at infinity, that is, for large values of the parameters $\alpha$, $\beta$. More formally, let $\gamma : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{H}$ be an unbounded path; we consider the following definition. The dual situation is also considered in [30, 3.2] but from a different perspective.

**Definition 5.1.** An object $A \in D^b(X)$ is asymptotically $\nu,\beta$-(semi)stable along $\gamma$ if the following two conditions hold:

(i) there is $t_0 > 0$ such that $A \in \mathcal{B}^{\gamma(t)}$ for every $t > t_0$;
(ii) for every sub-object $F \hookrightarrow A$ within $\mathcal{B}^{\gamma(t)}$ with $t > t_0$, there is $t_1 > t_0$ such that $\nu(\gamma(t)) F < (\leq) \nu(\gamma(t)) A$ for $t > t_1$.

In this section we characterize asymptotically $\nu,\beta$-semistable objects. More precisely, we establish the following results.

**Theorem 5.2.** Let $B \in D^b(X)$ be an object with $\text{ch}_0(B) \neq 0$.

1. $B$ is asymptotically $\nu,\beta$-(semi)stable along a path $\gamma(t) = (\alpha(t), \beta(t))$ such that $\beta(t) < \mu(B)$ for $t \gg 0$ if and only if $B$ is a $\mu_{\leq 2}$-stable sheaf.
2. $B$ is asymptotically $\nu,\beta$-(semi)stable along a path $\gamma(t) = (\alpha(t), \beta(t))$ such that $\beta(t) > \mu(B)$ for $t \gg 0$ and only if $S := B^{\gamma[-1]}$ is a $\mu_{\leq 2}$-(semi)stable sheaf such that $S^{**}/S$ either is empty or has pure dimension 1.

Theorem 5.2 is not new, though its statement and the second part especially, is different from previous versions. The proof of item (1) is essentially the same as [10, Proposition 14.2], which covers the case of $K3$ surfaces, compare also with [36, Proposition 2.5]. Part (2) is to be compared with [11, Proposition 2.3] in the case of surfaces, and [11, Proposition 5.1.3]. Since we will use Theorem 5.2 and the arguments in its proof in the subsequent sections, we include a full proof here. Our proof is longer than previous ones for two reasons. Firstly, we have a stronger form of asymptotic stability and secondly we do not assume that there are only finitely many $\nu$-walls above a certain horizontal line. Although the latter fact is true, we want to illustrate how it can be avoided, since it is not known for $\lambda$-stability. If we do assume that the $\nu$-walls are bounded above, then it follows that the $t_1$ of the definition of asymptotic $\nu$-stability can be chosen uniformly in $E$, that is, $t_1$ only depends on $\text{ch}_0(E)$.

The study of asymptotic $\nu,\beta$-stability is considerably simplified by the following observation:

**Lemma 5.3.**

1. If $B \in \mathcal{B}^{\beta}$ for all $\beta \ll 0$, then $B \in \text{Coh}(X)$.  

Proof. If $\mathcal{H}^{-1}(B) \neq 0$, then
\[ \text{ch}_1^B(\mathcal{H}^{-1}(B)[1]) = -\text{ch}_1(\mathcal{H}^{-1}(B)) + \text{ch}_0(\mathcal{H}^{-1}(B)) \beta < 0 \text{ for } \beta \ll 0, \]
so $B$ cannot lie in $\mathcal{B}^\beta$ for every $\beta \ll 0$.

For the second item, the idea is that $E$ must be $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}$-stable above the $\nu$-wall defined by the exact sequence. The local finiteness of the actual $\nu$-walls ensures that $E$ is $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}$-stable either immediately below or immediately above this wall. But we can show that the latter holds as follows. First observe that $\delta_{01}(E, F) \leq 0$. This is because if we split the Coh(X) sequence
\[ 0 \to \mathcal{H}^{-1}(G) \to F \to E \to \mathcal{H}^0(G) \to 0, \]
where $G = E/F$ in $\mathcal{B}^\beta$, via $K \to E$ then $\mu(K) \leq \mu(E)$ by the $\mu$-semistability of $E$ while $\mu(\mathcal{H}^{-1}(G)) \leq \beta < \mu(F)$ and so $\mu(F) < \mu(K) \leq \mu(E)$. We use Lemma 2.7[2] to compute the partial derivatives
\[ \partial_\alpha(\nu_{\alpha, \beta}(E) - \nu_{\alpha, \beta}(F)) = \partial_\alpha \frac{\Delta_{21}(E, F)}{\text{ch}_1^E(\text{ch}_1^F)} = -\frac{\alpha \delta_{01}(E, F)}{\text{ch}_1^E(\text{ch}_1^F)} \geq 0 \]
as $E$ is $\mu$-semistable. Consequently, $E$ cannot be destabilized on another wall outside of the this $\nu$-wall because it would need to be both stable and unstable immediately below which is impossible.

To complete the proof, observe that $F \hookrightarrow E \to G$ remains a short exact sequence in $\mathcal{B}^\beta$ at all points inside the $\nu$-wall corresponding to $F$. \hfill \Box

We will see that a similar statement holds for $\beta > \mu(E)$. So, for a given $E$, there is at most one actual $\nu$-wall destabilizing it one on each side of the vertical line $\{\beta = \mu(v)\}$, and then we can reduce the proof of Theorem 5.2 to the study of asymptotic $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}$-stability along horizontal lines. To this end we define:

\[ \Lambda^-_\pi := \{ (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{H} \mid \alpha = \pi, \beta < 0 \} \]
\[ \Lambda^+_\pi := \{ (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{H} \mid \alpha = \pi, \beta > 0 \}. \]

5.1. Asymptotics along $\Lambda^-_\pi$. The first part of Theorem 5.2 is proved in two separate lemmas.

**Lemma 5.4.** If $B \in D^b(X)$ is asymptotically $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}$-semistable along the horizontal half-line $\Lambda^-_\pi$, then $B$ is a $\mu_{\leq 2}$-semistable sheaf.

**Proof.** By Lemma 5.3, we may assume $B \in \text{Coh}(X) \cap \mathcal{B}^\beta$ for all $\beta \ll 0$.

Let $T \hookrightarrow B$ be a torsion subsheaf of $B$; if $\text{ch}_1(T) \neq 0$, then
\[ \lim_{\beta \to -\infty} \frac{1}{\beta} (\nu_{\alpha, \beta}(T) - \nu_{\pi, \beta}(B)) = \frac{1}{2} \]
contradicting asymptotic $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}$-semistability. If $\text{ch}_1(T) = 0$, then
\[ \nu_{\alpha, \beta}(B) < \nu_{\alpha, \beta}(T) = +\infty \]
for every $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{H}$, again contradicting asymptotic $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}$-semistability. So $B$ must be a torsion free sheaf.
Let $F$ be a subsheaf of $B$; since $F \in \mathcal{B}^3(X)$ for $\beta < \mu^-(F)$, $F$ is also a sub-object of $B$ within $\mathcal{B}^3(X)$ for $\beta < \min\{\mu^-(F), \mu^-(B)\}$. Note that

$$\lim_{\beta \to -\infty} (\nu_{\pi, \beta}(F) - \nu_{\pi, \beta}(B)) = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\delta_{10}(B, F)}{\text{ch}_0(F) \text{ch}_0(B)} \leq 0$$

by asymptotic $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}$-semistability. It follows that $\delta_{10}(B, F) \geq 0$, thus $B$ is $\mu$-semistable.

If $\delta_{10}(B, F) = 0$, then

$$\lim_{\beta \to -\infty} (-\beta)(\nu_{\pi, \beta}(F) - \nu_{\pi, \beta}(B)) = -\frac{\delta_{20}(B, F)}{\text{ch}_0(F) \text{ch}_0(B)} \leq 0$$

by asymptotic $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}$-semistability, thus $\delta_{20}(B, F) \geq 0$, as desired. □

Before going on to look at the converse we can make an interesting deduction from this:

**Proposition 5.5.** If $E$ is a $\mu$-semistable sheaf which is not $\mu_{\leq 2}$-semistable, then $E$ is not $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}$-semistable for any $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{H}$.

**Proof.** Suppose otherwise. Then by item (2) in Lemma 5.3 it follows that $E$ is asymptotically $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}$-semistable and then by Lemma 5.4 it must be $\mu_{\leq 2}$-semistable, a contradiction. □

Now we consider the converse to Lemma 5.4

**Lemma 5.6.** Fix $\pi > 0$. If $E$ is $\mu_{\leq 2}$-semistable, then there is $\beta_0 < 0$ (depending only on $\text{ch}_{\leq 2}(E)$ and $\pi$) such that $E$ is $\nu_{\pi, \beta}$-semistable for every $\beta < \beta_0$.

**Proof.** First, note that $E$ is $\mu$-semistable, thus $E \in \mathcal{T}_\beta \subset \mathcal{B}^3$ whenever $\beta < \mu(E)$. Then Lemma 5.3(2) implies that there is at most one actual $\nu$-wall for $E$ containing the point $(\pi, \beta_0)$, say (set $\beta_0 = \mu(E)$ if the wall does not exist). It follows that $E$ is $\nu_{\pi, \beta}$-stable for $\beta < \beta_0$. □

This completes the proof of the first part of Theorem 5.2

**Remark 5.7.** We will also need the following version of Lemma 5.6 for torsion sheaves: given any fixed $\pi > 0$, if $T \in \text{Coh}(X)_2$ is $\mu$-semistable, then there is $\beta_0 < 0$ such that $T$ is $\nu_{\pi, \beta}$-semistable for every $\beta < \beta_0$. The proof of this claim is similar to the proof of Lemma 5.6

We can use this to describe an asymptotic Harder-Narasimhan filtration for unstable objects as well.

**Proposition 5.8.** Let $\gamma(t) = (\alpha(t), \beta(t))$ be a path satisfying $\lim_{t \to -\infty} \beta(t) = -\infty$. If $B \in D^b(X)$ is an object for which there is $t_0 > 0$ such that $B \in \mathcal{B}^3(t)$ for all $t > t_0$, then $B$ admits a filtration in $\mathcal{B}^3(t)$

$$0 = B_0 \subseteq B_1 \subset B_2 \subset \cdots \subset B_n = B,$$

whose factors $G_k := B_k/B_{k-1}$ for are asymptotically $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}$-semistable and satisfy

1. $\nu_{\gamma(t)}(B_1) = +\infty$ for every $t > 0$ if $B_1 \neq 0$;
2. for each $k = 2, \ldots, n$, there is $t_k > t_0$ such that $\nu_{\gamma(t)}(G_k) - \nu_{\gamma(t)}(G_{k+1}) > 0$ for every $t > t_k$. 
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Proof. The first item of Lemma 5.3 implies that $B$ must be a sheaf, so it admits a filtration as described in Lemma 2.20; this is the filtration we are looking for.

Indeed, each factor in the filtration of Lemma 2.20 belongs to $\mathcal{B}^\beta$ for $\beta \ll 0$, according to Lemma 5.6 and Remark 5.7. The property in item (1) is clear, since $B_1 \in \text{Coh}_1(X)$; item (2) is a consequence of the following claim: given $E, F \in \text{Coh}(X)$ with $\text{ch}_{\leq 1}(E), \text{ch}_{\leq 1}(F) \neq 0$, then $\nu_{\gamma(t)}(E) > \nu_{\gamma(t)}(F)$ for $t \gg 0$ if and only if $\lambda_2(E, F) > 0$. This can be explicitly checked for the path $\gamma(t) = (\sigma, -t)$ using the limits calculated in the proof of Lemma 5.4; the verification for more general paths is similar. 

It is tempting to think that if $B \in \mathcal{B}^\beta$ (respectively, $A \in \mathcal{A}^{\alpha, \beta}$) for some $\alpha, \beta$ then $B^t \in \mathcal{B}^{-\beta}$ (respectively, $A^t \in \mathcal{A}^{\alpha, -\beta}$). The problem is that the duals of objects $B$ in $\mathcal{F}_\beta$ are not necessarily in $\mathcal{F}_\beta$ because it might be that $\mu^+(B) = \beta$ and then $\mu^-(B^t) = -\beta$. Similarly for objects $A$ in $\mathcal{F}_{\alpha, \beta}$. However, an asymptotic version of this statement does hold.

First we prove a technical lemma which allows us to turn Proposition 5.8 about the existence of asymptotic Harder–Narasimhan filtrations into a more precise bound on $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}$ so long as we constrain the unbounded curve we move along. To this end, we introduce the following definition.

**Definition 5.9.** A path $\gamma : (0, \infty) \to \mathbb{H}$ with $\gamma(t) = (\alpha(t), \beta(t))$ is called an unbounded $\Theta^+$-curve if $\lim_{t \to \infty} \beta(t) = -\infty$ and for all $v$ such that $v_{\leq 1} \neq (0, 0)$, $\nu_{\gamma(t)}(v) > 0$ for all $t$ sufficiently large. Equivalently, the curve is asymptotically bounded by $\Theta_v$, ie

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{\alpha(t)}{\beta(t)} > -1.$$ 

We define the dual path $\gamma^*$ is defined to be $\gamma^*(t) = (\alpha(t), -\beta(t))$. Similarly, we define $\gamma$ to be an unbounded $\Theta^+$-curve if $\lim_{t \to \infty} \beta(t) = +\infty$ and for all $v$ such that $v_{\leq 1} \neq (0, 0)$, $\nu_{\gamma(t)}(v) < 0$ for all $t$ sufficiently large.

In particular, $\gamma$ is an unbounded $\Theta^-$-curve if and only if $\gamma^*$ is an unbounded $\Theta^+$-curve.

**Remark 5.10.** If $v_0 = 0$ while $v_1 \neq 0$ then the first condition implies the second; indeed, we have $\nu_{\gamma(t)}(v) = v_2/v_1 - \beta(t)$ and the first condition implies that this is positive for all $t \gg 0$.

When $v_0 \neq 0$, the condition on $\nu_{\gamma(t)}$ is satisfied, for example, if there is an $\epsilon > 0$ such that for all $t \gg 0$, $\alpha(t)^2 < \beta(t)^2(1 - \epsilon)$: we have

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{\nu_{\gamma(t)}(v)}{\beta(t)} > \lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{v_2 - \beta(t)v_1 + \beta(t)^2\epsilon v_0/2}{-v_1\beta(t) + v_0\beta(t)^2} = \frac{\epsilon}{2} > 0.$$ 

So again this is positive for all $t \gg 0$.

**Example 5.11.** Note that, since $s > 0$, $\alpha^2 < \beta^2(1 - \epsilon)$ sufficiently far along $\Gamma_{v, s}$ and so $\Gamma_{v, s}$ is an unbounded $\Theta^+$-curve.

**Lemma 5.12.** Let $\gamma$ be an unbounded $\Theta^-$-curve. If $B \in \mathcal{B}^{\beta(t)}$ for all $t \gg 0$ and $\text{ch}_{\leq 1}(B) \neq (0, 0)$, then there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that $\nu_{\gamma_t}^{-}(B) > 0$ for all $t > t_0$.

**Proof.** Using Remark 5.8 there is a $t_0$ large enough so that there is a fixed Harder–Narasimhan factor of $B$, say $B_0 \in \mathcal{B}^{\beta(t)}$, which satisfies $\nu_{\gamma(t)}(B_0) = \nu_{\gamma(t)}^{-}(B)$ for all $t > t_0$. If $\text{ch}_0(B_0) = \text{ch}_1(B_0) = 0$ then $\nu_{\gamma(t)}(B_0) = \infty$ for all $t \gg 0$ and we are
done. Otherwise, \( ch_{<1}(B_0) \neq (0,0) \). Then \( \nu_{\gamma(t)}(B_0) \) is asymptotically positive by the assumption on \( \gamma(t) \), thus \( \nu_{\gamma(t)}^{-1}(B) > 0 \) for \( t \gg 0 \), as desired. \( \Box \)

Combining this with Proposition \[2.13\] we deduce:

**Proposition 5.13.** Consider an unbounded \( \Theta^- \)-curve \( \gamma \) as above. Then the following are equivalent for an object \( E \in D^b(X) \).

1. \( E \in \mathcal{A}^\gamma(t) \) for all \( t \gg 0 \),
2. \( E \in \mathcal{B}^\beta(t) \) for all \( t \gg 0 \),
3. \( E \in \text{Coh}(X) \).

If \( E \in \text{Coh}(X) \) contains no subsheaf of dimension 0 then there is a \( t_0 > 0 \) such that for all \( t > t_0 \), \( E^\gamma \in \mathcal{A}^\gamma(t) \).

**Proof.** When \( E \) is torsion free, the claim follows immediately from Proposition \[2.13\] and the observation that \( \nu_{\gamma(t)}^+(E^\gamma) = -\nu_{\gamma(t)}(E') \to -\infty \) as \( t \to \infty \). Otherwise, let \( T \subset E \) be its maximal torsion subsheaf. Then the hypothesis implies that \( T^\gamma \in \mathcal{A}^\gamma(t) \) for all \( t \gg 0 \) and so dualizing \( T \to E \to E/T \) we deduce the last part. \( \Box \)

### 5.2. Asymptotics along \( \Lambda^+ \)

We now move to the proof of the second part of Theorem \[5.2\] starting with a characterization of objects lying in \( \mathcal{B}^\beta \) for \( \beta \gg 0 \).

**Lemma 5.14.** Let \( B \in D^b(X) \). There is \( \beta_0 > 0 \) such that \( B \in \mathcal{B}^\beta \) for every \( \beta > \beta_0 \) if and only if the following conditions hold:

1. \( \mathcal{H}^p(B) = 0 \) for \( p \neq -1,0 \);
2. \( \mathcal{H}^{-1}(B) \) is a torsion free sheaf;
3. \( \mathcal{H}^0(B) \) is a torsion sheaf.

**Proof.** Set \( E := \mathcal{H}^{-1}(B) \) and \( P := \mathcal{H}^0(B) \). If \( B \in \mathcal{B}^\beta \) for every \( \beta \gg 0 \), then the first two items follow immediately. For the third one, just note that

\[
\lim_{\beta \to \infty} \frac{ch_1^\beta(P)}{\beta} = -ch_0(P) \geq 0,
\]

thus \( ch_0(P) = 0 \).

Conversely, we have that \( E \in \mathcal{F}_\beta \) for \( \beta \geq \mu^+(E) \) and \( P \in \mathcal{T}_\beta \) for every \( \beta \); it immediately follows that \( B \in \mathcal{B}^\beta \) for \( \beta \geq \mu^+(E) \). \( \Box \)

**Lemma 5.15.** If \( B \in D^b(X) \) is asymptotically \( \nu_{\alpha,\beta} \)-semistable along \( \Lambda^+ \), then \( S := B^\vee[-1] \) is a \( \mu_{\leq 2} \)-semistable sheaf such that \( S^* \) or \( S \) either is empty or has pure dimension 1.

**Proof.** For simplicity, set \( E := \mathcal{H}^{-1}(B) \) and \( P := \mathcal{H}^0(B) \). We start by checking that \( E \) is reflexive and \( \dim P \leq 1 \).

Indeed, if \( E \) is not reflexive, then \( Q_E := E^*/E \in \mathcal{T}_\beta \subset \mathcal{B}^\beta(X) \) for every \( \beta \), thus \( Q_E \) is a sub-object of \( B \) within \( \mathcal{B}^\beta(X) \); but \( \nu_{\alpha,\beta}(Q_E) = +\infty \) for every \( (\alpha,\beta) \in \mathcal{H} \), so we have a contradiction with the asymptotic \( \nu_{\alpha,\beta} \)-semistability of \( B \).

**Lemma 5.14** implies that \( ch_0(P) = 0 \). If \( ch_1(P) \neq 0 \), then

\[
\lim_{\beta \to \infty} \frac{1}{\beta} (\nu_{\alpha,\beta}(B) - \nu_{\alpha,\beta}(P)) = \frac{1}{2},
\]

also contradicting the asymptotic \( \nu_{\alpha,\beta} \)-semistability of \( B \).
Any $U$ is a subsheaf of $P$ has dimension less than 1, so $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}(U) = +\infty$ and hence it cannot lift to a sub-object of $B$. By Proposition 2.15, we conclude that $S := B^r[-1]$ is a torsion free sheaf; note that $\text{Ext}^1(S^*, S, O_X) \simeq \text{Ext}^2(S, O_X) = H^1(B) = 0$, so $S^*/S$ cannot have a 0-dimensional subsheaf.

Let $G$ be a quotient sheaf of $S$, hence $G^*$ is a subsheaf of $S^* = H^{-1}(B)$, and $G^*[1] \to B$ is a sub-object within $B^\beta(X)$ for every $\beta > \mu^+(G^*)$. Note that $\delta_{10}(G^*[1], B) = \delta_{10}(S, G)$, so
\[
\lim_{\beta \to \infty} (\nu_{\alpha, \beta}(G^*[1]) - \nu_{\alpha, \beta}(B)) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\delta_{10}(S, G)}{\text{ch}_0(G) \text{ch}_0(S)} \leq 0
\]
by asymptotic $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}$-semistability, so $S$ is $\mu$-semistable.

Next, note that $\delta_{20}(G^*[1], B) = \delta_{20}(G, S)$, thus if $\delta_{10}(S, G) = 0$, then
\[
\lim_{\beta \to \infty} (\beta(\nu_{\alpha, \beta}(G^*[1]) - \nu_{\alpha, \beta}(B))) = - \frac{\delta_{20}(G, S)}{\text{ch}_0(G) \text{ch}_0(S)} \leq 0,
\]
implying that $\delta_{20}(S, G) \leq 0$, meaning that $S$ is $\mu_{\leq 2}$-semistable.}

Finally, we provide the converse of the previous lemma, thus concluding the proof of Theorem 5.2. For $E \in \text{Coh}(X)$, note Lemma 5.14 implies that $E^r[-1] \in B^\beta$ for $\beta > 0$ if and only if $E$ has no subsheaf of dimension at most 1, and the cokernel of the canonical morphism $E \to E^*$ has pure dimension 1.

**Lemma 5.16.** If $S$ is a $\mu_{\leq 2}$-semistable sheaf such that $S^*/S$ is either empty or has pure dimension 1, then there is $\beta_0 > 0$ such that $S^r[-1]$ is $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}$-semistable for all $\beta > \beta_0$.

**Proof.** The observation in the previous paragraph implies that $B := S^r[-1] \in B^\beta$ for every $\beta \geq -\mu(S)$.

Let $F \hookrightarrow B$ be a sub-object within $B^\beta$ for $\beta > -\mu(S)$; note that $\text{ch}_0(H^0(F)) = 0$ by Lemma 5.14. Assume first that $\text{ch}_0(F) = \text{ch}_0(H^{-1}(F)) \neq 0$. It follows that
\[
\mu(F) = \mu(H^{-1}(F)) - \frac{\text{ch}_1(H^0(F))}{\text{ch}_1(H^{-1}(F))} \leq \mu(H^{-1}(F)) \leq \mu(S^*) = \mu(B)
\]
since $S^*$ is $\mu$-semistable and $H^{-1}(F)$ is a subsheaf of $S^*$. We then have
\[
\lim_{\beta \to \infty} (\nu_{\alpha, \beta}(F) - \nu_{\alpha, \beta}(B)) = \frac{1}{2} (\mu(F) - \mu(B)) \leq 0.
\]
If $\mu(F) = \mu(B)$, then $\mu(H^{-1}(F)) = \mu(S^*)$ and $\text{ch}_1(H^0(F)) = 0$. Denoting $G := B/F$ the corresponding quotient in $B^\beta$, we have the following exact sequence in $\text{Coh}(X)$:
\[
(33) \quad 0 \to H^{-1}(F) \to S^* \to H^{-1}(G) \xrightarrow{f} H^0(F) \to \text{Ext}^1(S, O_X) \to H^0(G) \to 0;
\]
Clearly, $\ker f$ is torsion free, and this implies that $H^{-1}(F)$ is reflexive. Let $P \hookrightarrow H^0(F)$ be a monomorphism of sheaves that lifts to $F$, and let $U$ be the image of the composite morphism of sheaves $P \hookrightarrow H^0(F) \to \text{Ext}^1(S, O_X)$. Since $U \in T_\beta \subset B^\beta$ for every $\beta$, $U$ coincides with the image of the composite monomorphism $P \hookrightarrow F \hookrightarrow S^r[-1] \in B^\beta$, so Proposition 2.15 implies that $U = 0$, so in fact $P = 0$. We therefore conclude, again by Proposition 2.15, that $F := F^r[-1]$ is a torsion free sheaf. Dualizing and shifting the triangle
\[
F \to B \to G \to F[1]
\]
in $D^b(X)$, we obtain the triangle
\[ \mathcal{G} \to S \to F \to G' \quad \mathcal{G} := G'[-1] \]
which yields the following exact sequence in $\text{Coh}(X)$
\[ 0 \to \mathcal{H}^0(\mathcal{G}) \to S \to F \to \mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{G}) \to 0. \]
Note that $\text{ch}_k(\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{G})) = 0$ for $k = 0, 1$; it follows that
\[ \delta_{20}(B, G) = \delta_{20}(S, \mathcal{G}) = \delta_{20}(S, \mathcal{H}^0(\mathcal{G})) + \text{ch}_0(S) \text{ch}_2(\mathcal{H}^1(\mathcal{G})) \geq 0. \]
We then obtain
\[ \lim_{\beta \to \infty} \frac{\beta (\nu_{\tau, \beta}(B) - \nu_{\tau, \beta}(G))}{\text{ch}_0(B) \text{ch}_0(G)} = - \frac{\delta_{20}(B, G)}{\text{ch}_0(B) \text{ch}_0(G)} \leq 0 \]
If the equality holds, then both $\text{ch}_{\leq 2}(F)$ and $\text{ch}_{\leq 2}(G)$ are multiples of $\text{ch}_{\leq 2}(B)$, meaning that $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}(F) = \nu_{\alpha, \beta}(B) = \nu_{\alpha, \beta}(G)$ for every $(\alpha, \beta)$. In any case, we conclude that there is $\beta_0 > 0$ such that $\nu_{\tau, \beta}(B) \leq \nu_{\tau, \beta}(B)$ for $\beta \geq \beta_0$.
Next, assume that $\text{ch}_0(F) = \text{ch}_0(\mathcal{H}^{-1}(F)) = 0$, so $\mathcal{H}^{-1}(F) = 0$ and $F \in T_\beta$. If $\text{ch}_1(F) \neq 0$, then
\[ \lim_{\beta \to \infty} \frac{1}{\beta} (\nu_{\tau, \beta}(B) - \nu_{\tau, \beta}(F)) = \frac{1}{2}, \]
so $\nu_{\tau, \beta}(B) > \nu_{\tau, \beta}(F)$ for $\beta \gg 0$. Therefore, it is enough to consider the case when $\dim F \leq 1$.
The sequence in display (33) simplifies to
\[ 0 \to S^* \to \mathcal{H}^{-1}(G) \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{H}^0(G) \to \mathcal{E}xt^1(S, \mathcal{O}_X) \to \mathcal{H}^0(G) \to 0. \]
Dualizing the sequence $0 \to S^* \to \mathcal{H}^{-1}(G) \to \ker f \to 0$ we get that $S^{**} \simeq \mathcal{H}^{-1}(G)^*$, and therefore $\ker f = 0$. This means that $F$ is a subsheaf of $\mathcal{E}xt^1(S, \mathcal{O}_X)$ that lifts to $B = S^\vee[-1]$, contradicting Proposition 2.15. \hfill \square

6. The Differential Geometry of Surface Walls

**Definition 6.1.** Let $u$ and $v$ be real numerical Chern characters such that $v$ satisfies the Bogomolov inequality. We define the surface $\Sigma_{u,v} \subset \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^+$ to be the vanishing locus of
\[ f_{u,v}(\alpha, \beta, s) = \Delta_{32}(\alpha, \beta) - \alpha^2(s - 1/3)\Delta_{12}(\alpha, \beta), \]
the numerator of the difference of slopes $\lambda_{\alpha, \beta, s}(u) - \lambda_{\alpha, \beta, s}(v)$ now regarded as a function of all three parameters $(\alpha, \beta, s)$. Note that
\[ \Sigma_{u,v} = \Sigma_{v,u} = \Sigma_{\phi u + \psi v, u}, \]
for any real $\phi$ and $\psi \neq 0$.

In addition, we will denote by $\Gamma_v$ (without the parameter $s$ in the subscript) the surface \{\tau_{u,v}(\alpha, \beta) = 0\} $\subset \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^+$. In this notation, $\Gamma_{v, s_0} = \Gamma_v \cap \{s = s_0\}$ and $\Upsilon_{u,v,s_0} = \Sigma_{u,v} \cap \{s = s_0\}$, for any $s_0 \in \mathbb{R}^+$.

Our aim in this section is to explore some of the differential geometric properties of $\Sigma_{u,v}$ with a view to understanding finiteness properties of $\lambda$-walls. We will assume that $v$ is a fixed real numerical Chern character. Note that, by (34) we can assume that $u_0 = v_0$. It turns out to be best to consider the two cases $u_0 = 0 = v_0$ and $u_0 \neq 0 \neq v_0$. The former is dealt with in Remark 6.5.
Generically, $\Sigma_{u,v}$ can have components of dimensions 0, 1 or 2. In fact, each of these do arise at least as numerical surface walls. For example, for $v = (3, -2, -1/2, 1)$ and $u = (0, 1, -1/2, 0)$

$$f_{u,v}(0, \beta, s) = (\beta + 1)^2(\beta^2 + 2)/4$$

and $f_{u,v}(\alpha, \beta, s) \neq 0$ whenever $\alpha \neq 0$. At special points where the curves $\Gamma_{v,s}$ and $\Theta_v$ intersect, $\Sigma_{u,v}$ is guaranteed to be locally a surface.

**Lemma 6.2.** At the points of intersection $\Gamma_{u,s} \cap \Gamma_{v,s}$, $\Theta_u \cap \Theta_v$ and $\Gamma_{v,s} \cap \Theta_v$, $\Sigma_{u,v}$ is two dimensional.

In other words, a surface wall $\Sigma_{u,v}$ does have two dimensional components whenever it is not empty.

**Proof.** Note that each pair of curves divides a small ball around their intersection into 4 regions otherwise the (algebraic) curves must coincide. They cannot coincide except possibly for the Theta curves but then $\Sigma_{u,v} = \Theta_u \times \mathbb{R}$. Then for a small arc around the intersection point in two of the regions, the function $f_{u,v}(\alpha, \beta, s)$ is positive on one curve and negative on the other, and so must vanish at some point in the region for each arc sufficiently close to the intersection point. Combining with Lemma [4.11] we see that $\Sigma_{u,v}$ is two dimensional in a neighbourhood of the point. \)

We now look more carefully at the differential geometry of the surface wall $\Sigma_{u,v}$. The normal vector is given by the gradient of $f(\alpha, \beta, s)$.

**Lemma 6.3.**

\[
\begin{align*}
\partial_\alpha f &= \alpha(1 + 2(s - 1/3))\Delta_{21} - \alpha \Delta_{30} + \alpha^3(s - 1/3)\Delta_{10}, \\
\partial_\beta f &= -\Delta_{31} - \alpha^2(s - 1/3)\Delta_{20}, \\
\partial_s f &= \alpha^2\Delta_{21}, \\
\partial^2_\alpha f &= (1 + 2(s - 1/3))\Delta_{21} - \Delta_{30} + \alpha^2(5s + 1/3)\Delta_{10}, \\
H f &= \begin{pmatrix}
\partial^2_\alpha f & 2\alpha(s - 1/3)\Delta_{02} & 2\alpha \Delta_{21} - \alpha^3 \Delta_{01} \\
2\alpha(s - 1/3)\Delta_{02} & \Delta_{21} + \Delta_{30} + \alpha^2(s - 1/3)\Delta_{10} & -\Delta_{20} \\
2\alpha \Delta_{21} - \alpha^3 \Delta_{01} & -\Delta_{20} & 0
\end{pmatrix}.
\end{align*}
\]

**Proposition 6.4.** For any $s_1 > s_0 > 0$, $\Sigma_{u,v} \cap \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \times \{s_0 \leq s \leq s_1\}$ is compact if and only if $\Delta_{01} \neq 0$.

**Proof.** This follows from Lemma [4.8] and its converse which follows because the leading homogeneous terms of $f(\alpha, \beta, s)$ (up to a constant) are

$$\Delta_{01}(6s\alpha^2(\alpha^2 + \beta^2) + (\beta^2 - \alpha^2)^2)$$

which vanishes for $s > 0$ only if either $\alpha = \beta = 0$, or $\Delta_{01} = 0$. \)

Note that when $s = 0$ the surface is unbounded along $\alpha = \pm \beta$.

**Remark 6.5.** In the case where $v_0$ and $u_0$ are non-zero, if $u$ gives rise to a $\nu$-wall with respect to $v$ then $\Delta_{01} \neq 0$. This is then $\Delta_{21}(\alpha, \beta) = 0$ has a one dimensional locus. So if $\Delta_{01} = 0$ (everywhere) then $\Delta_{20} = 0$ along the $\nu$-wall and it follows that $(u_0, v_1, v_2) \propto (v_0, v_1, v_2)$ which then cannot have a $\nu$-wall as $\Delta_{21} = 0$ everywhere. In fact, if $\Delta_{01} = 0$ then if $\Delta_{20}(\alpha, \beta) = 0$ for some $(\alpha, \beta)$ it must vanish identically.
and again \((u_0, u_1, u_2) \propto (v_0, v_1, v_2)\). But then \(\Delta_{21} = 0\) identically. On a \(\lambda\)-wall we then have \(\Delta_{32} = 0\) and so \(u \propto v\). Hence, \(\Delta_{02} \neq 0\).

If \(v_0 = 0 = u_0\) then \(\Delta_{01} = 0\) identically for all \(i\). Then there are no \(\nu\)-walls. The numerical \(\lambda\)-walls are nested ellipses much as \(\nu\)-walls are for the truncated Chern characters. It follows that \(\Sigma_{u,v}\) is always regular and horizontal exactly on \(\Gamma_{v,s}\).

The variation in \(s\) is just a vertical scaling by \(\sqrt{s + 1/3}\).

**Theorem 6.6.** Suppose \(u\) and \(v\) are real numerical Chern characters with \(v_0 \neq 0\). Any two dimensional component of the surface wall \(\Sigma_{u,v}\) is regular everywhere except in one of the following situations:

1. it intersects a \(\nu\)-wall away from \(\Gamma_v\) at \(\alpha = 0\), in which case it is locally \(\alpha^2 - \beta^2\);
2. it intersects a \(\nu\)-wall and \(\Gamma_v\) at \(s = 1/3\) for \(\alpha > 0\) in which case it is locally \((\alpha - \alpha_0)^2 + (\alpha - \alpha_0)(s - 1/3) + \frac{\Delta_{02}(\alpha_0, \beta_0)}{\Delta_{01}(\alpha_0, \beta_0)}(\beta - \beta_0)(s - 1/3) = 0\) up to scale;
3. it intersects a \(\nu\)-wall, \(\Gamma_v, \alpha = 0\) and \(s = 1/3\) in which case the surface is smooth (locally given by \((\beta - \beta_0)^3 = 0\)), or
4. \(u\) and \(v\) are special vectors satisfying \(\mu(v) = \mu(u)\), \(\Delta_{03} = \Delta_{21}\), \(\Delta_{20} \neq 0\) and \(\text{ch}_{\alpha,\mu}(u) = 0 = \text{ch}_{\alpha,\mu}(u)\). Then \(\Sigma_{u,v}\) is regular except along the line \(\{\beta = \mu(v), s = 1/3\} \cup \{\alpha = 0, s < 1/3\}\) and it is locally \((\beta - \beta_0)((s_0 - 1/3)(\alpha - \alpha_0) + (\beta - \beta_0)^2)\) at \((\alpha_0, \mu(v), 1/3)\) and at \((0, \beta_0, s_0)\).

Note that in (1) we also allow the degenerate case where the \(\nu\)-wall has zero radius. An example of this can be seen for \(v = (2, 0, -1, 0)\) illustrated in Figure 11 in Section 8.

**Proof.** Suppose \((\alpha, \beta, s)\) is a non-regular point of \(\Sigma_{u,v}\). Then \(\nabla f_{u,v}(\alpha, \beta) = 0\).

From \(\partial_s f_{u,v} = 0\) we have either \(\alpha = 0\) or \(\Delta_{12}(\alpha, \beta) = 0\). We will treat these two cases separately.

First suppose \(\alpha \neq 0\). Then \(\Delta_{12} = 0\). From \(f_{u,v} = 0\), we also have \(\Delta_{32} = 0\). From \(\partial_\alpha f_{u,v} = 0\) we have \(\Delta_{30} = \alpha^2(\alpha^2 - 1/3)\Delta_{10}\) and from \(\partial_\beta f_{u,v} = 0\) we have \(\Delta_{31} = -\alpha^2(s - 1/3)\Delta_{20}\). Assume that \(\text{ch}_{\alpha}^\beta(v) \neq 0\) and \(s \neq 1/3\). Then Lemma 2.7 item 3 implies that \(\Delta_{31} = 0\) and then \(\Delta_{20} = 0\) so that also \(\Delta_{10} = 0\). Since \(v_0 \neq 0\), Lemma 2.7 item 3 implies \(u \propto v\) which is a contradiction. So we must have \(\text{ch}_{\alpha}^\beta(v) = 0 = \text{ch}_{\alpha}^\beta(u)\) or \(s = 1/3\). In the case \(s \neq 1/3\), it follows that \(\Delta_{01} = 0\). From \(\partial_\beta f_{u,v} = 0\) we have \(\Delta_{02} = 0\) but this contradicts \(\Delta_{03} = 0\). So we must have \(s = 1/3\) and either (a) \(\Delta_{01} = 0 = \Delta_{30}\) along \(\text{ch}_{\alpha}^\beta(v) = 0\) or (b) the \(\lambda\) curve passes through both a \(\nu\)-wall and \(\Gamma\).

We consider case (a). From \(\Delta_{31} = 0\) we then have that \(u \propto v\) unless \(\text{ch}_{\alpha}^\beta(u) = 0 = \text{ch}_{\alpha}^\beta(v)\) along \(\beta = \mu(v)\). Then we have that the conditions are equivalent to

\[
\Delta_{01} = 0, \\
v_3 v_0^2 - v_1 v_2 v_3 + v_1^3 / 3 = 0, \\
\Delta_{03} = \Delta_{12}, \quad \text{and} \\
\Delta_{02} \neq 0.
\]

The first equality for \(u\) also follows (from the second). Note that in this situation \(\Sigma_{u,v}\) is singular all along \(\beta = \mu(v)\) and so also also at \(\alpha = 0\). Along \(\beta = \mu(v)\) the
Hessian of $f$ vanishes. The only third derivatives to be non-zero (up to symmetry) are $\partial^3_{\beta\beta}f_{u,v} = 2\Delta_{02}$ and $\partial_\alpha\partial_\beta\partial_v f_{u,v} = 2\alpha\Delta_{02}$. So the local model for $f_{u,v}$ is

$$2\Delta_{02}(\beta - \mu(v))(\beta - \mu)^2 + (\alpha - \alpha_0)(s - 1/3).$$

This is a triple zero at $\alpha = 0$ and looks like $y = 0$ union $y^2 = xz$ for $\alpha \neq 0$. In fact, since $f_{u,v}(\alpha, v_1/v_0) = 0$ we have that $(\beta - v_1/v_0)$ is a linear factor of $f_{u,v}$.

Now suppose $\alpha = 0$. Then $\partial_\beta f_{u,v} = 0$ implies $\Delta_{31}(\alpha, \beta) = 0$. But from $f_{u,v} = 0$ we have $\Delta_{02}(\alpha, \beta) = 0$. If the point is not on $\Gamma$ then $\Delta_{21}(\alpha, \beta) = 0$ and so $(\alpha, \beta)$ is on a $\nu$-wall. Then the Hessian at this point is diagonal $\text{diag}(-\Delta_{30}(0, \beta), \Delta_{30}(0, \beta), 0)$. Then $f_{u,v}$ is locally of the form $\Delta_{02}(\alpha^2 - (\beta + \beta_0)^2)$ to lowest order as required. Conversely, such a point (where a numerical $\lambda$-wall intersects its associated $\nu$-wall away from $\Gamma_v$ on $\alpha = 0$) is always singular of this form.

Alternatively, if the point lies on $\Gamma_{v,s} \cap \Gamma_{u,s}$ and $\alpha = 0$ then the Hessian is $\text{diag}(\Delta_{21}(0, \beta)(s + 1/3), \Delta_{21}(0, \beta), 0)$. So $\Delta_{21} = 0$. But this can only happen if either $\text{ch}_{\nu}^2(v) = 0 = \text{ch}_{\nu}^3(u)$ or we are also on a $\nu$-wall. In the latter case we are in case (b), see below. Otherwise $\Delta_{01} = 0$. But then we either have the special situation described before or $\Delta_{20} = 0$ and $\Delta_{30} = 0$ so we have $u \propto v$. This is impossible. In the special case above we have $Hf_{u,v} = 0$ again and the same third derivatives as before are non-zero.

In case (b) above we have $\Delta_{21} = 0$ and $\text{ch}_{\nu}^{\alpha, \beta}(u) = 0 = \text{ch}_{\nu}^{\alpha, \beta}(u)$ so that $\Delta_{3i} = 0$ for all $i$. Since it also crosses a $\nu$-wall we must have $\Delta_{20} \neq 0$. When $\alpha \neq 0$, the local form in (2) can then be read off the Hessian. Note that, at $s = 1/3$ the wall has a standard cusp singularity given by $(\alpha - \alpha_0)^2 \propto (\beta - \beta_0)^3$. Otherwise the Hessian vanishes at the point. The third derivatives are then all zero except for $\partial^3_\beta f_{u,v} = -2\Delta_{02}$. This gives the required form in (3).

\[\square\]

**Remark 6.7.** The special case where the surface is not regular for $\alpha > 0$ splits into two types: $v_1 = 0$ and $v_1 \neq 0$. The former case gives $v_3 = 0 = u_3$ and $u_1 = 0$. Then, so long as $\Delta_{02} \neq 0$, the surface has the local form as stated in Theorem 6.6. It follows that $f(\alpha, \beta, s) = \beta\Delta_{02}(3s - 1)/\alpha^2 + \beta^2)$, so $\Sigma_{u,v}$ is reducible. As a concrete (actually generic) example, consider the Chern character $v = (2, 0, -3, 0)$ and $u = \text{ch}^{2}(O_X)$. On $\mathbb{P}^3$, $v$ is the Chern character of rank 2 locally free sheaf $E$ with $c_1(E) = 0$ and $c_2(E) = 3$. A $\lambda$-wall then corresponds to the existence of a section and so is a actual wall.

On the other hand, if $v_1 = 0$, the picture will be the same translated by $\mu(v)$ along $\beta$. Note that [36] will determine $u_1$ for arbitrary non-zero $\text{ch}_{\nu}^3(v)$ and $u_0$. Then [36] will determine $v_3$, while [37] will determine $u_2$: one root is also a root of $\Delta_{02} = 0$ and so must be dismissed, and then $u_2$ is uniquely determined. This gives a 3 parameter family of possible rational examples but to correspond to actual objects there are strong diophantine constraints which will depend on the 3-fold $X$.

**Corollary 6.8.** If $\Delta_{01} \neq 0$ then $\Sigma_{u,v} \cap \{\alpha > 0, s > 0, s \neq 1/3\}$ is regular and $\Gamma_{u,v,s} = \Sigma_{u,v} \cap \{s = s_0\}$ is bounded for each $s_0 > 0$.

A numerical $\lambda$-wall $\Gamma_{\alpha, \beta, s}$ is said to be horizontal at a point $(\alpha_0, \beta_0) \in \mathbb{H}$ if $\partial_\beta f_{u,v, s}(\alpha_0, \beta_0) = 0$.

**Proposition 6.9.** Assume $u$ and $v$ are as in Theorem 6.6. Let $s = 1/3$. A numerical $\lambda$-wall is horizontal at a point $(\alpha, \beta) \notin \Theta_v$ if and only if $(\alpha, \beta) \in \Gamma_{v,s}$ or $(\alpha, \beta) \in \Xi_{u,v}$ away from $\Theta_v$. It is a local maximum on $\Gamma_{v,s}$ and a local minimum
Figure 6. An example of a reducible surface $\Sigma_{u,v}$ with $u = (1,0,0,0)$ and $v = (2,0,-3,0)$, illustrating case (4) of Theorem 6.6.

of $\Xi_{u,v}$ except for the special case where $\delta_{01} = 0$ and $(\alpha, \beta) \in \Gamma_{v,s} \cap \Xi_{u,v}$ where it is a point of inflection.

Proof. By Theorem 6.6, $\Upsilon_{\alpha, \beta, s}$ is horizontal if and only if $\partial_\beta f_{u,v,s} = \Delta_{13}(\alpha, \beta) = 0$. Assume first that the point is on $\Gamma_{v,s}$ (but not on $\Theta_v$) so that $\text{ch}_{2}^{\alpha, \beta}(v) = 0$. Then also $\text{ch}_{3}^{\alpha, \beta}(u) = 0$ because $\text{ch}_{2}^{\alpha, \beta}(v) \neq 0$ and $f_{u,v,s}(\alpha, \beta) = 0$. Hence, $\Delta_{31}(\alpha, \beta) = 0$ and so $\partial_\beta f_{u,v,s} = 0$ and the wall is horizontal. The second derivative is then

$$\frac{d^2 \alpha}{d \beta^2} = -\frac{\partial_\beta^2 f_{u,v,s}}{\partial_\alpha f_{u,v,s}} = \frac{\Delta_{21} + \Delta_{30}}{\alpha \Delta_{21} - \alpha \Delta_{30}} = -\frac{1}{\alpha}.$$

If the point is on the associated $\nu$-wall $\Xi_{u,v}$, then, since $\text{ch}_{1}^{\beta}(v) \neq 0$, we have

$$\Delta_{32} = \frac{\text{ch}_{2}^{\alpha, \beta}(v)}{\text{ch}_{1}^{\beta}(v)} \Delta_{31},$$

and so if also $\Delta_{32} = 0$ then the $\Upsilon_{u,v,s}$ must be horizontal there, unless the point lies on $\Theta_v$. The second derivative (if the point is not on $\Gamma_{v,s}$) is $1/\alpha$. Note that when the point is also on $\Gamma_{v,s}$, the wall is singular by Theorem 6.6 item 2 and otherwise $\Delta_{21}$ and $\Delta_{30}$ cannot vanish simultaneously except in the special case where $\delta_{01} = 0$. Consequently, there is never a point of inflection on a numerical wall except at $\Gamma_{v,s} \cap X_{u,v}$ in this special case.

Assume that $\Upsilon_{u,v,s}$ is horizontal at a point $(\alpha, \beta)$ not on $\Gamma_{v,s}$. Then $\Delta_{13}(\alpha, \beta) = 0$ and from $\Delta_{23}(\alpha, \beta) = 0$ we also have $\Delta_{12}(\alpha, \beta) = 0$ by Lemma 2.7(3) since $\text{ch}_{3}^{\alpha, \beta} \neq 0$ by assumption. So $(\alpha, \beta)$ is on the associated $\nu$-wall. \qed
Remark 6.10. As a numerical \( \lambda \)-wall might be horizontal as it crosses \( \Theta_\alpha \), though it generally is not. In that case, we can use \( \beta \) and \( s \) as local coordinates on the surface and the second fundamental form at that point is \( \Pi = \frac{1}{\alpha} d\beta^2 \). Then the Gauss curvature is zero and the mean curvature is \( 1/2\alpha \).

Now we consider how numerical \( \lambda \)-walls vary with \( s \). Note that \( \Sigma_{u,v} \cap \{ s = s_0 \} = \Upsilon_{u,v,s_0} \).

Theorem 6.11. Let \( \Sigma' \) be a non-empty connected component of \( \Sigma_{u,v} \).

1. Suppose \( s_0 \geq 1/3 \). If \( \Sigma' \cap \{ s = s_0 \} \neq \emptyset \), then \( \Sigma' \cap \{ s = s_1 \} \neq \emptyset \) for every \( s_1 \geq 1/3 \).
2. Suppose \( s_0 < 1/3 \). If \( \Sigma' \cap \{ s = s_0 \} \neq \emptyset \), then \( \Sigma' \cap \{ s = s_1 \} \neq \emptyset \) for every \( 0 \leq s_1 < s_0 \).

If \( \Sigma' \cap \{ s = s_0 \} \neq \emptyset \), then for every \( 0 < s_1 \leq s_0 \), \( \Sigma' \cap \{ s = s_1 \} \neq \emptyset \).

In other words, if a numerical \( \lambda \)-wall exists for one \( s_0 \geq 1/3 \), then it must also exist for all \( s \geq 1/3 \), whereas if \( s_0 < 1/3 \), then it need only exist for \( s < s_0 \). This means that numerical \( \lambda \)-walls can only be “created” for \( s < 1/3 \) and as \( s \) decreases. We shall see below that walls cannot be “created” in \( R^+_{v,s} \) even when \( s < 1/3 \) but they can be created in \( R^0_{v,s} \).

Proof. Observe first that we may assume boundedness away from \( s = 0 \), because if \( \Delta_{01} = 0 \), then \( \Delta_{20} \neq 0 \) and so \( f_{u,v,s}(\alpha, \beta) = 0 \) is a cubic in \( \beta \). Then it must have a solution for all \( \alpha \). But if a wall crosses \( \alpha = 0 \) for one value of \( s \), then it crosses for all \( s \).

By Theorem 6.6, the surface is regular except at special points on \( \alpha = 0 \) where there are multiple tangent planes which include the \( s \) direction or we are in case [2] of the theorem. But this latter case cannot arise in the present situation. This means that if \( \Sigma_{u,v} \cap \{ s = s_1 \} \) is empty for some \( s_1 > 0 \), then there is some \( s_0 \) such that \( \partial_\alpha f_{u,v,s_0} = 0 = \partial_\beta f_{u,v,s_0} \) and \( \partial_\beta f_{u,v}|_{s=s_0} \neq 0 \). It follows that \( \alpha \neq 0 \) and \( \Delta_{12}(\alpha, \beta) \neq 0 \).

Then \( \Sigma_{u,v}|_{s=s_0} \) is a union of closed curves, unbounded curves or one or more distinct points. Suppose \( (\alpha, \beta) \) is a point on a closed curve component. Since \( f \) is a quadratic function of \( \alpha^2 \) it follows that nearby \( (\alpha, \beta) \) there are two distinct solutions for a fixed \( \beta \). If the curve does not cross \( \alpha = 0 \) then there are 4 distinct solutions sufficiently close to two points in \( \alpha > 0 \). But then there are also 4 points for \( \alpha < 0 \) which is impossible. So the curve must cross \( \alpha = 0 \). But this is a contradiction as \( \alpha \neq 0 \). We can also eliminate the possibility of unbounded curves as follows. Each unbounded curve must have two distinct unbounded branches. Then nearby \( s_0 \), there will be four unbounded branches. But the implicit function defining the \( \lambda \)-wall \( \Upsilon_{u,v,s_0} \) is only asymptotically cubic (see the proof of Proposition 4.4) and so this is impossible.

Consequently, \( \Sigma_{u,v} \cap \{ s = s_0 \} \) consists only of isolated points. Now consider one of these points, with coordinates \( (\alpha_0, \beta_0) \). From the regularity can use \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) as local coordinates on \( \Sigma_{u,v} \) at this point. Note that the first fundamental form at \( (\alpha_0, \beta_0) \) is \( d\alpha^2 + d\beta^2 \) from the vanishing of \( -\partial_\alpha f_{u,v}/\partial s f_{u,v} \) and \( -\partial_\beta f_{u,v}/\partial s f_{u,v} \).
From $f_{u,v}(α_0, β_0, s_0) = 0$, $∂_α f_{u,v}(α_0, β_0, s_0) = 0$ and $∂_β f_{u,v}(α_0, β_0, s_0) = 0$ we have

\begin{align}
\Delta_{32} &= α_0^2 (s_0 - 1/3) ∆_{12} \\
\Delta_{30} &= (1 + 2 (s_0 - 1/3)) ∆_{21} + α_0^2 (s_0 - 1/3) ∆_{10} \\
\Delta_{31} &= α_0^2 (s_0 - 1/3) ∆_{02},
\end{align}

where we abbreviate $Δ_{ij}(α_0, β_0)$ to $Δ_{ij}$ and also for the rest of the proof. Together with Lemma 2.7 item 1, these identities imply that

\begin{equation}
α^2(s_0 - 1/3) ∆^2_{02} = -(2s_0 + 1/3) ∆^2_{12}.
\end{equation}

Since $α ≠ 0$ and $Δ_{12} ≠ 0$ we deduce that $Δ_{02} ≠ 0$ and $s < 1/3$. This establishes the first part of the Theorem.

For the second part we show that the mean curvature at our point is negative and so the surface must curve towards towards $s < s_0$. To this end observe that the Gauss curvature $K$ is a positive multiple of $∂^2_α f_{u,v} ∂^2_β f_{u,v} - (∂_α β f_{u,v})^2$. Using (40) we have

\begin{align}
∂^2_α f_{u,v} &= 2α_0^2 (2s_0 + 1/3) ∆_{10} \\
∂_α β f_{u,v} &= 2α_0 (s_0 - 1/3) ∆_{02} \\
∂^2_β f_{u,v} &= α_0^2 (s - 1/3) ∆_{10} + 2(s_0 + 2/3) ∆_{21}.
\end{align}

Using (42), we have $(∂_α β f_{u,v})^2 = -(2s_0 + 1/3)(s_0 - 1/3) ∆^2_{21}$. Then $K$ has the same sign as

$$
α_0^4(s_0 - 1/3) ∆^2_{10} + α_0^2(s_0 + 2/3) ∆_{10} ∆_{21} + (s_0 - 1/3) ∆^2_{21} = (s_0 - 1/3)(α_0 ∆_{10} + ∆_{12})^2 + 3s_0 α_0^2 ∆_{10} ∆_{21}
$$

But the tangent plane at $(α_0, β_0)$ only intersects $Σ_{u,v}$ at that point and so $K ≥ 0$. The first term is negative and so we must have $Δ_{10} Δ_{21} > 0$.

The mean curvature is then

$$
-\frac{∂^2_α f_{u,v}}{∂_α f_{u,v}} - \frac{∂^2_β f_{u,v}}{∂_β f_{u,v}} = -3s_0 α_0 \frac{Δ_{10}}{Δ_{21}} - \frac{2}{α_0} \left( s_0 + \frac{2}{3} \right) < 0
$$

as required. \qed

We observe that numerical $λ$-walls do admit isolated points, see Figure 7 below.

As a consequence of Theorem 6.6 and the proof of Theorem 6.11 we can deduce that one dimensional components of numerical $λ$-walls for a fixed $s$ are regular away from $ν$-walls.

**Corollary 6.12.** For any $s > 0$ and any real numerical Chern characters $u$ and $v$, any connected component of a numerical $λ$-wall $Υ_{u,v}$ in $H$ is regular as a real curve away from $Ξ_{u,v}$. In particular, if there is no associated $ν$-wall for the pair $u$, $v$, then $Υ_{u,v}$ is always regular.

**Proof.** Away from the $ν$-wall $Ξ_{u,v}$ (if non empty) when $s = 1/3$, $Σ_{u,v}$ is regular by Theorem 6.6. But by the proof above, the only place where the plane tangent to $Σ_{u,v}$ is parallel to the $(α, β)$ plane occurs at isolated points and not in a one-dimensional portion of the surface wall. \qed
Figure 7. This is the surface wall $\Sigma_{u,v}$ for $v = (2, -1, -1, 0)$ and $u = (0, 1, -10, -3)$. Taking $s_0 \simeq 0.0569$, the point $(\beta, \alpha) \simeq (3.52, 6.24)$ is an isolated point of the numerical $\lambda$-wall $\Upsilon_{u,v,s_0} = \Sigma_{u,v}|_{s_0}$.

We complete this section by returning to the issue of the intersection between numerical $\lambda$-walls for $v$ and the curves $\Theta_v$ and $\Gamma_{v,s}$.

Unraveling the equality in (30) yields a cubic polynomial equation for $\beta_0$. This means that the intersection $\Upsilon_{u,v,s} \cap \Gamma_{v,s}$ consists of at most three points away from $\Theta_v$; in addition, according to Lemma 4.11, the number of intersection points does not depend on the parameter $s$. Notice that the total number of intersection points of a $\lambda$-wall for $v$ with $\Gamma_{v,s}$ will increase by 1 if $q(v) < 0$.

Let us now examine one situation in which $\Upsilon_{u,v,s} \cap \Gamma_{v,s}$ contains two points.

**Lemma 6.13.** If a connected component of a numerical $\lambda$-wall $\Upsilon_{u,v,s}$ crosses a connected component of $\Gamma_{v,s}$ twice away from the hyperbola $\Theta_v$, then the associated numerical $\nu$-wall $\Xi_{u,v}$ is non-empty.

**Proof.** By the Lemma 4.11 we can let $s = 1/3$. Then the two intersection points are local maxima of $\Upsilon_{u,v,1/3}$. By Corollary 6.12 the component is regular or has a tacnode on a $\nu$-wall. If it is regular then it must have a minimum between the two maxima. Proposition 6.9 implies that such a minimum must lie on the associated $\nu$-wall. □

Figure 8 illustrates the typical situation described in Lemma 6.13 and shows that it does arise. It is easy to see that the intersection with $\alpha = 0$ must happen to the right of $\Gamma_{v,s}^-$ because $\Gamma_{v,s}^-$ is monotonic.
The situation in Figure 8 also demonstrates another phenomenon in which a numerical $\lambda$-wall intersects horizontal lines four times. When this happens it must be that $f(\alpha, \beta)$ has three turning points along this horizontal line. But note that $\partial_\beta f = -\Delta_{31}$ when $s = 1/3$. On the other hand, $\partial_\alpha \Delta_{31} = 0$ and so the solutions of $\Delta_{31} = 0$ are vertical lines. But these intersect the wall at its horizontal turning points (the green points in Figure 8). The middle one also intersects $\Upsilon_{u,v,s,1/3}$ again at a minimum or on $\Theta_v$ which must therefore also be on $\Xi_{u,v}$. For a connected component we already could deduce this because such a component must have at least one minimum but the same will follow even when the geometry of the wall does not require there to be a minimum. This more precise reasoning allows us to refine Lemma 6.13.

**Lemma 6.14.** If a numerical $\lambda$-wall $\Upsilon_{u,v,s}$ intersects $\Gamma_{v,s}^-$ twice, then $\Upsilon_{u,v,s}$ must intersect $\Theta_v$.

**Proof.** Note that Lemma 6.13 shows that if the walls is a connected component then it must intersect $\Xi_{u,v}$. Since $\Delta_{31} = 0$ are vertical lines there must be minima above or below the maxima (the green dots on $\Gamma_{v,1/3}^-$ in Figure 8). Since the wall cannot cross $\Gamma_{v,s}^-$ for a third time because it would have to double back on itself and there can only be at most two solutions of $\Delta_{32} = 0$ along any vertical line, it must cross $\Xi_{u,v}$ a third time at a point which is not a minimum which must therefore be on $\Theta_v$. Note that an alternative picture to Figure 8 has the wall cross $\alpha = 0$ twice to the left of $\Gamma_{v,s}^-$. In that case it only crosses $\Xi_{u,v}$ once and then $\Xi_{u,v}$ does not intersect $\Gamma_{v,u}^-$ between the two intersection points.
Now we assume the wall is two nested components. First we observe that this hypothesis is independent of $s$. To see that note that if a component is created at $(\alpha, \beta)$ then there would be 6 distinct solutions of $f(\alpha, \beta) = 0$ along $\beta = \beta'$ which is impossible. Then these two bounded components must have maxima at $s = 1/3$ which must intersect $\Gamma_{v,1/3}^-$.

Then there are three vertical line components of $\Delta_{31} = 0$ which intersect $\Gamma_{v,1/3}^-$ at the maxima of the wall at distinct $\beta$ values. Since the inner bounded component must have a maximum (on $\Gamma_{v,1/3}^-$) the middle component of $\Delta_{31} = 0$ intersects the wall at that point and so intersects the outer component away from $\Gamma_{v,1/3}^-$. But this point cannot be a point of inflection (see the remark after Proposition 6.9) and so must be a minimum which must therefore be on a $\nu$-wall. If the wall is otherwise in the exterior of the $\nu$-wall then that point must be at the maximum of the $\nu$-wall and so is on $\Theta_v$. Otherwise, it must cross the $\nu$-wall again which is not a turning point and so must also cross $\Theta_v$. In fact this minimum of $\Upsilon_{u,v,1/3}$ in the outer component must have another maximum which must be on $\Gamma_v$ (see Figure 9 below for a concrete example of this case).

We can argue similarly to Lemma 6.14 in $R_v^0$:

**Lemma 6.15.** If a numerical $\lambda$-wall $\Upsilon_{u,v,s}$ intersects $\Gamma_{v,s}^0$ twice, then $\Upsilon_{u,v,s}$ intersects $\Xi_{u,v}$ and $\Theta_v$.

**Proof.** Observe first that by Lemma 6.11 the hypothesis and conclusion are independent of $s$ and so we may set $s = 1/3$.

If $\Upsilon_{u,v,s}$ has a single component then there must be a minimum between the maxima and so it crosses $\Xi_{u,v}$ at that point. If there are two components then the geometry does not require there to be a minimum. But then there are three vertical components of $\Delta_{31} = 0$. The middle one intersects the inner component at its maximum and then it must intersect the other component at a minimum (by Proposition 6.9) which must be on $\Xi_{u,v}$.

In the last case, the outer component is either unbounded and the minimum occurs on $\Theta_v$ or if it is bounded there is a further maximum which must be on $\Gamma_{v,1/3}^\pm$ and so the wall again crosses $\Theta_v$. The shape is illustrated in Figure 9.

We can now state the main Theorem of this section:

**Theorem 6.16.** Suppose a real numerical Chern character $v$ satisfies the Bogomolov inequality and $v_0 \neq 0$. Any connected bounded component of a numerical $\lambda$-wall in $R_{v,s}$ for some $s \geq 1/3$ intersects $\Gamma_{v,s}^-$. 

**Proof.** Let the component be $\Upsilon_{u,v,s}$ and suppose for a contradiction that it does not cross $\Gamma_{v,s}^-$. By Theorem 6.11 this component must exist for all $s$ and so we may assume $s = 1/3$. By Theorem 6.6 $\Upsilon_{u,v,1/3}$ is regular except possibly in case 2 of that Theorem, in which case the singular point is on $\Gamma_{v,s}^-$ as required. Otherwise $\Upsilon_{u,v,1/3}$ is regular and so it must have a maximum. By Proposition 6.9 it must intersect $\Gamma_{v,1/3}^-$ at this point.

**Remark 6.17.** In other words, if we want to classify all of the actual $\lambda$-walls in the region $R_{v,s}^-$ then we only need to locate the ones which cross $\Gamma_{v,s}^-$. But note that the wall may not be actual as it crosses $\Gamma_{v,s}^-$. 

On the other hand, this fails for $s < 1/3$ because isolated walls can appear as $s$ decreases. Some will be unbounded as $s \to 0$ but others may persist as isolated closed curves.

Finally, observe that analogous statements also hold for $\Gamma_{v,s}^+$ and the region to the right of it.

7. Asymptotic $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-stability in $R_{v,s}^+$

Similarly to Definition 5.1, we introduced the following definition, where $\gamma : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{H}$ be an unbounded path.

**Definition 7.1.** An object $A \in D^b(X)$ is asymptotically $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-(semi)stable along $\gamma$ if the following two conditions hold for a given $s > 0$:

(i) there is $t_0 > 0$ such that $A \in A^\gamma(t)$ for every $t > t_0$;

(ii) for every sub-object $F \hookrightarrow A$ within $A^\gamma(t)$ with $t > t_0$, there is $t_1 > t_0$ such that $\lambda_{\gamma(t),s}(F) < (\leq) \lambda_{\gamma(t),s}(A)$ for $t > t_1$.

Our first goal is to characterize asymptotically $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-semistable objects with numerical Chern character $v$ satisfying $v_0 > 0$ and the Bogomolov inequality along two families of paths contained in the region $R_v^-$, namely the paths $\Gamma_{v,s}^-$ for each $s > 0$, and $\Lambda_{\alpha}$ for each $\alpha > 0$ (see the notation introduced in display (32)).

It turns out the asymptotically $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-semistable objects are the same for both paths: Gieseker semistable sheaves. However, it is not clear to us whether every path contained in $R_v^-$ has the same property.

We then invoke Proposition 5.13 to characterize asymptotically $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-semistable objects along the paths $\Gamma_{v,s}^+$ and $\Lambda_{\alpha}^+$. More precisely, we show that $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-semistable objects along $\Gamma_{v,s}^+$ and $\Lambda_{\alpha}^+$ are duals of Gieseker semistable sheaves.

First, we provide a simple consequence of asymptotic $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-semistability along a horizontal line.

**Lemma 7.2.** Fix $\sigma > 0$. If an object $A \in D^b(X)$ is asymptotically $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-semistable along the path $\gamma(t) = (\sigma, \pm t)$ then $Q^{\text{tilt}}(A) \geq 0$.

**Proof.** We discuss the path $\gamma_-$, the other case being analogous. The hypothesis imply that there is $\beta_0 < 0$ such that $A$ is $\lambda_{\pi,\beta,s}$-semistable for every $\beta < \beta_0$, so the support property Proposition 2.4 implies that $Q_{\pi,\beta}(A) \geq 0$ for every $\beta < \beta_0$.

Therefore,

$$\lim_{\beta \to -\infty} \frac{1}{\beta^2} Q_{\pi,\beta}(A) = Q^{\text{tilt}}(A) \geq 0,$$

as desired. \qed

7.1. Asymptotics along $\Gamma_{v,s}^-$. We now turn to asymptotically $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-semistable objects with Chern character $v$ (of an object) along the curve $\Gamma_{v,s}^-$. We assume from now on that $v$ satisfies $v_0 \neq 0$ and the Bogomolov inequality (3).

Since $\text{ch}_1^\beta(E) \neq 0$ along $\Gamma_{v,s}^\pm$, we have:

$$\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}(E) = 0 \iff \alpha^2 = \frac{\text{ch}_1^\beta(E)}{(s + 1/6) \text{ch}_1^\beta(E)}.$$

so we can use $\beta < 0$ as a parameter.
Substituting for $\alpha^2$ as in equation (43) into the expression for $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}(u)$, we define the function $\bar{\lambda}_{v,\beta,s}(u)$; to be precise

$$
\bar{\lambda}_{v,\beta,s}(u) = \frac{\ch_1^\beta(u) \ch_1^\beta(v) - \ch_1^\beta(u) \ch_1^\beta(v)/u}{\ch_2^\beta(u) \ch_1^\beta(v) - u_0 \ch_1^\beta(v)/(2s + 1/3)}
$$

expresses $\lambda$-slope of an object $F$ with $\ch(F) = u$ along $\Gamma_{v,s}^\pm$. If $\ch_0(F) \neq 0$, the previous expression yields

$$(44) \quad \bar{\lambda}_{v,\beta,s}(F) = \frac{6s + 1}{9s \ch_0(E) \ch_0(F)} \cdot \frac{\delta_{01} \beta^3 - 3 \delta_{02} \beta^2 + 3(\delta_{03} + \delta_{12}) \beta - 3 \delta_{13}}{\beta^3 + \text{lower order terms}},$$

where $\delta_{ij} = \delta_{ij}(F, E)$, as defined in equation (11). When $\ch_0(F) = 0$ and $\ch_1(F) \neq 0$, we obtain

$$(45) \quad \bar{\lambda}_{v,\beta,s}(F) = -\frac{1}{3} \ch_0(E) \ch_1(F) \beta^3 + \text{lower order terms}$$

Note that a numerical $\lambda$-wall $Y_{\alpha,\beta,s}$ crosses $\Gamma_{v,s}^\pm$ precisely at the zeros of the function $\bar{\lambda}_{v,\beta,s}(u)$.

The behaviour of the $\nu$-slope of an object $F \in D^b(X)$ along $\Gamma_{v,s}^\pm$ can be analysed in a similar way. Substituting for $\alpha^2$ as in equation (43) into the expression for $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}(F)$, we obtain

$$
\lim_{\beta \to -\infty} -\frac{1}{\beta} \nu_{\alpha,\beta}(F) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{s}{2s + 1/3}, & \text{if } \ch_0(F) \neq 0, \\
1, & \text{if } \ch_0(F) = 0, \ \ch_1(F) \neq 0
\end{cases}
$$

We are now in position to state the main result of this section.

**Theorem 7.3.** Let $v$ be a numerical Chern character with $v_0 \neq 0$ satisfying the Bogomolov inequality (3). For each $s > 0$, an object $A \in D^b(X)$ with $\ch(A) = v$ is asymptotically $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-(semi)stable along $\Gamma_{v,s}$ if and only if $A$ is a Gieseker (semi)stable sheaf.

The proof will be done in a series of lemmas.

**Lemma 7.4.** For every $s > 0$, if there is $\beta_0 < 0$ such that $E \in A^{\alpha,\beta}$ for $(\alpha, \beta) \in \Gamma_{v,s}$ with $\beta < \beta_0$, then $E \in \Coh(X)$.

This claim actually follows directly from Proposition 5.13 but we give an alternative hands-on proof.

**Proof.** Using the notation of Section 2.3, note that $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}(E_1) \leq 0$, for every $(\alpha, \beta) \in \Gamma_{v,s}$ with $\beta < \beta_0$. However, equation (40) implies that for every sub-object $F \hookrightarrow E_1$ there exists $\beta'_0 < 0$, depending only on $\ch_{\leq 2}(F)$, such that $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}(F) > 0$ for every $(\alpha, \beta) \in \Gamma_{v,s}$ and $\beta < \beta'_0$, leading to a contradiction. It follows that $E_1 = 0$.

On the other hand, the inequality

$$
\ch_1^\beta(E_{01}) = \ch_1(E_{01}) - \beta \ch_0(E_{01}) \leq 0
$$

for all $\beta \ll 0$ implies that $\ch_0(E_{01}) = 0$, thus $E_{01} = 0$ since $E_{01}$ is torsion free. \qed

**Lemma 7.5.** For every $s > 0$, if $E$ is an asymptotically $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-(semi)stable object along $\Gamma_{v,s}$, then $E$ is a Gieseker (semi)stable sheaf.
Proof: If $E$ is asymptotically $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-semistable along $\Gamma_{v,s}$, then $E$ is a sheaf by Lemma 7.4 or Proposition 5.13.

If $E$ is not torsion free, let $F \hookrightarrow E$ be its maximal torsion subsheaf; if $T \hookrightarrow F$ is a subsheaf of dimension $\leq 1$, then $T \hookrightarrow E$ is a morphism in $A^{\alpha,\beta}$ for $(\alpha, \beta) \in \Gamma_{v,s}$ and $\beta \ll 0$, since $T \subset T_{\alpha,\beta}$ for every $(\alpha, \beta)$. We have that $\text{ch}_0(T) = \text{ch}_1(T) = 0$, then

$$\overline{\lambda}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(T) = \begin{cases} -\beta + \frac{\text{ch}_3(T)}{\text{ch}_2(T)}, & \text{if } \text{ch}_2(F) \neq 0, \\ +\infty, & \text{if } \text{ch}_2(T) = 0 \end{cases}$$

so $T$ would destabilize $E$. Therefore, we can assume that $F$ has pure dimension 2; let $T$ be its maximal $\hat{\mu}$-semistable subsheaf. Remark 5.7 implies that $T \in \mathcal{A}^{\alpha,\beta}$ for $(\alpha, \beta) \in \Gamma_{v,s}$ and $\beta \ll 0$, thus $T \hookrightarrow E$ is a morphism in $A^{\overline{\alpha},\overline{\beta}}$ in the same range. Since $\text{ch}_0(T) = 0$ and $\text{ch}_1(T) \neq 0$, we have

$$\lim_{\beta \to -\infty} -\frac{1}{\beta} \overline{\lambda}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(F) = \frac{1}{3},$$

again contradicting asymptotic $\lambda$-semistability. We therefore conclude that $E$ must be torsion free.

If $F \hookrightarrow E$ is a proper (torsion free) subsheaf with $\delta_{01}(F,E) \neq 0$, then equation (44) implies that

$$\lim_{\beta \to -\infty} \overline{\lambda}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(F) = -\frac{6s + 1}{9s \text{ch}_0(E) \text{ch}_0(F)} \delta_{01}(F,E) \leq 0$$

by hypothesis, thus $\delta_{01}(F,E) \geq 0$.

If $\delta_{01}(F,E) = 0$, then equation (44) implies that

$$\lim_{\beta \to -\infty} (-\beta) \overline{\lambda}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(F) = -\frac{6s + 1}{3s \text{ch}_0(E) \text{ch}_0(F)} \delta_{02}(F,E) \leq 0$$

thus $\delta_{02}(F,E) \geq 0$.

Finally, if $\delta_{01}(F,E) = \delta_{02}(F,E) = 0$, then

$$\lim_{\beta \to -\infty} \beta^2 \overline{\lambda}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(F) = -\frac{6s + 1}{3s \text{ch}_0(E) \text{ch}_0(F)} \delta_{03}(F,E) \leq 0$$

thus $\delta_{03}(F,E) \geq 0$, with equality holding if and only of $\delta_{03}(F,E) = 0$ as well. In other words, $E$ is Gieseker (semi)stable. \hfill \Box

Finally, we still need to prove the converse of Lemma 7.5. Before this we need to show that there are only finitely many possible characteristic classes of destabilizing objects of a fixed Gieseker semistable sheaf.

Lemma 7.6. Fix $\alpha > 0$, $s > 0$ and $\beta$ and suppose a Gieseker semistable sheaf $E$ with $\text{ch}(E) = v$ is $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta}$-unstable (respectively properly $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-semistable). Then there are objects $A$ and $B$ such that $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}(A) > \lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}(E)$ (respectively, $\overline{\lambda}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(A) = \overline{\lambda}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(E)$), $A \in \mathcal{A}^{\alpha,\beta} \cap \mathcal{B}^\beta \cap \text{Coh}(X)$, and there is a short exact sequence in $\mathcal{A}^{\alpha,\beta_0}$

$$0 \to A \to E \to B \to 0,$$

such that

1. $B \in \mathcal{B}^{\beta_0} \cap \text{Coh}(X)$,
2. or $B \in \mathcal{B}^{\beta_0}[1] \cap \text{Coh}[1]$.
Proof. Suppose first that $E$ is $\lambda$-unstable. Then there is maximally destabilizing sequence $A' \hookrightarrow E \twoheadrightarrow B'$ so that $A'$ is $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-semistable. Then the conclusion follows immediately from Proposition 2.12 and the observation that $\overline{\lambda}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(F) \geq \overline{\lambda}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(A')$ by the assumption on $A'$. The other case is similar. \hfill $\square$

We now show that if $E$ is a Gieseker stable sheaf then there can be no object $F \in A^{\alpha,\beta}$ for all $\beta < \overline{\beta}$ which destabilizes $E$.

Lemma 7.7. Fix $s > 0$, $\overline{\beta}$. Suppose $E$ is a Gieseker stable sheaf with $\text{ch}(E) = v$ and $F \rightarrow E$ is a subobject in both $\text{Coh}(X)$ and $A^{\alpha,\beta}$ such that $E/F \in A^{\alpha,\beta} \cap \text{Coh}(X)$ for all $\beta < \overline{\beta}$ and $(\alpha, \beta) \in \Gamma_{v,s}$ then there is some $\beta_0 < \overline{\beta}$ such that $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}(F) < \lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}(E)$ for all $\beta < \beta_0$.

Proof. We can compute the same limits as in the proof of Lemma 7.5 we first have

$$\lim_{\beta \to -\infty} \overline{\lambda}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(F) = -\frac{6s + 1}{9s \text{ch}_0(E) \text{ch}_0(F)} \delta_{01}(F, E) \leq 0,$$

since $\delta_{01}(F, E) \geq 0$ by hypothesis. If $\delta_{01}(F, E) = 0$, then

$$\lim_{\beta \to -\infty} (-\beta)\overline{\lambda}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(F) = -\frac{6s + 1}{3s \text{ch}_0(E) \text{ch}_0(F)} \delta_{02}(F, E) \leq 0$$

because $\delta_{02}(F, E) \geq 0$. Finally, if $\delta_{02}(F, E)$ also vanishes, then

$$\lim_{\beta \to -\infty} \beta^2\overline{\lambda}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(F) = -\frac{6s + 1}{3s \text{ch}_0(E) \text{ch}_0(F)} \delta_{03}(F, E) \leq 0$$

since $\delta_{03}(F, E) \geq 0$, with equality holding if and only if $\delta_{03}(F, E) = 0$ as well, which implies that $\overline{\lambda}_{\alpha,\beta,s}(F) = 0$ for every $(\alpha, \beta) \in \Gamma_{v,s}$ for $\beta \ll 0$. \hfill $\square$

Returning to our asymptotics along $\Gamma_{v,s}$, we now aim to show that there are only finitely many possible destabilizing Chern characters of $E$. We do this in Lemma 7.8 below for which we need to observe that, in the situation of Lemma 7.6 if $E$ is $\lambda_{\gamma(t),s}$-stable for $0 < t < \epsilon$ for some $\epsilon > 0$ but unstable for $-\epsilon < t < 0$ and $\gamma(0)$ is sufficiently far enough along $\Gamma_{v,s}$ then, by Proposition 4.18 either there is an actual $\lambda$-wall (corresponding to a destabilizing object $F$ for $-\epsilon < t < 0$) containing $\gamma(0)$ or $\Theta_{v,s}$ contains $\gamma(0)$, where $u = \text{ch}(F)$. So the only way a Gieseker semistable sheaf $E$ could not be asymptotically $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-semistable along $\Gamma_{v,s}$ is if $\Gamma_{v,s}$ can be partitioned into an infinite sequence of intervals where $E$ is alternately unstable and semistable (or stable). The following lemma explains why this cannot happen.

Lemma 7.8. Suppose $E$ is a Gieseker semistable sheaf with $\text{ch}(E) = v$ then there is a $\overline{\beta}$ such that for any $\beta < \overline{\beta}$ there is no actual $\lambda$-wall $W_{u,v,s}$ intersecting $\Gamma_{v,s}$ at $(\alpha, \beta)$.

Proof. Assume the conclusion is false. Then pick a point $P$ on $\Gamma_{v,s}$ and let $\gamma : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$ be a path with $\gamma(0) = P$ such that $\beta(t) < \beta(t')$ for all $t > t'$ and $\gamma(t) \in \Gamma_{v,s}$ for all $t \geq 0$. Suppose without loss of generality that $E$ is unstable at $P$ (otherwise choose a different $P$). By Lemma 7.6 we can assume that there is a destabilizing object $F$ which is in $\text{Coh}(X)$ and either (1) that $G := E/F$ is in $\text{Coh}(X)$ or (2) that $G := (E/F)[-1]$ is in $\text{Coh}(X)$. Let $u = \text{ch}(F)$.

In case (1), the previous Lemma 7.7 and the observation that both $F$ and $G$ remain in $A^{\alpha(t)}$ for all $t > 0$ imply that there is some $t > 0$ such that $\gamma(t) \in W_{u,v,s}$. 


The same conclusion holds in case (2) because \( \Theta_{v-u} \) must cross \( \Gamma_{v,s}^- \) above \( P \) and \( \lambda_{\gamma(t),s}(G) \to +\infty \) as \( \gamma(t) \) approaches \( \Theta_{v-u} \).

By assumption \( E \) does not remain \( \lambda_{\gamma(t),s} \)-stable for all larger \( t \). So there must exist an actual \( \lambda \)-wall \( W_{u,v,s} \) crossing \( \Gamma_{v,s}^- \) twice by repeating the above argument. Then Lemma 6.13 implies that there is an actual \( \nu \)-wall corresponding to \( E \) and \( F \). But there is at most one of these by Lemma 5.3(2).

**Lemma 7.9.** If \( E \) is a Gieseker (semi)stable sheaf then \( E \) is asymptotically \( \lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s} \)-(semi)stable along \( \Gamma_{v,s}^- \).

**Proof.** If \( E \) is Gieseker stable then the first part of Definition 7.1 follows from the fact that \( E \in \text{Coh}(X) \) and Proposition 5.13 and the second now from Lemma 7.8.

The statement for semistability follows by inducting on the length of the Jordan–Hölder filtration of \( E \).

**Remark 7.10.** Just as for Proposition 5.8 we can deduce that any \( E \in \mathcal{A}^{\alpha,\beta} \) for all \( (\alpha, \beta) \) along an unbounded \( \Theta^- \) path \( \gamma(t) \) in \( R_v^- \) has an asymptotic Harder–Harasimhan filtration for \( \lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s} \)-stability from Lemma 7.9.

We finish this section with a useful technical result about possible destabilizing sequences along \( \Gamma_{v,s}^- \). It demonstrates the benefits of looking for actual \( \lambda \)-walls along \( \Gamma_{v,s}^- \), and we will use it to study the walls for null correlation sheaves on \( \mathbb{P}^3 \) in Section 8.3.

### 7.2. Asymptotics along \( \Lambda_{\overline{\sigma}}^- \)

Next, we study objects that are asymptotically \( \lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s} \)-semistable along a horizontal line \( \{ \alpha = \overline{\sigma} \} \), or asymptotically \( \lambda_{\overline{\sigma},\beta,s} \)-semistable. The key is to observe that \( \Lambda_{\overline{\sigma}}^- \) is eventually in \( R_{v,s}^L \) and we can use Theorem 6.16. We establish the following result.

**Theorem 7.11.** Let \( v \) be a Chern character of an object of \( D^b(X) \) satisfying \( v_0 \neq 0 \) and the Bogomolov inequality \[3\]. For each \( s \geq 1/3 \) and each \( \overline{\sigma} > 0 \), an object \( A \in D^b(X) \) is asymptotically \( \lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s} \)-semistable objects along \( \Lambda_{\overline{\sigma}}^- \) if and only if \( A \) is a Gieseker semistable sheaf.

The strategy of the proof is very similar to the one used in Theorem 7.3 though with different calculations; we include them here for the sake of completeness. Indeed, note that

\[
\lim_{\beta \to -\infty} \frac{-1}{\beta} \nu_{\overline{\sigma},\beta}(F) = \begin{cases} 
1/2, & \text{if } ch_0(F) \neq 0; \\
1, & \text{if } ch_0(F) = 0 \text{ and } ch_1(F) \neq 0.
\end{cases}
\]

As before, the claim follows from item (1) of Proposition 5.13 alternatively, it can also be proved in the same manner as Lemma 7.4 above.

**Lemma 7.12.** Fix \( \overline{\sigma} > 0 \). If there is \( \beta_0 < 0 \) such that \( E \in \mathcal{A}^{\overline{\sigma},\beta} \) for every \( \beta < \beta_0 \), then \( E \in \text{Coh}(X) \).

The next step is to understand the difference in \( \lambda \)-slopes; note that

\[
\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}(F) - \lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}(E) = \frac{f_{u,v}(\alpha,\beta)}{\rho_u(\alpha,\beta)\rho_v(\alpha,\beta)}
\]

with \( u = ch(F) \) and \( v = ch(E) \). The full expression of numerator is given by equation 27; the numerator is given by

\[
\rho_u(\alpha,\beta)\rho_v(\alpha,\beta) = \frac{1}{4} ch_0(F) ch_0(E)\beta^4 - \frac{1}{2} (ch_1(F) ch_0(E) + ch_1(E) ch_0(F))\beta^3
\]
\[
+ \left( \frac{1}{2} \frac{\chi_0(F) \chi_0(E) \alpha^2 + \chi_1(F) \chi_1(E) + \frac{1}{2} (\chi_0(F) \chi_2(E) + \chi_2(F) \chi_0(E))}{\beta^2} \right) \beta^2
\]

(terms of lower order in \(\beta\)).

With these formulas at hand, we can establish the if part of Theorem 7.8. First we need to extend Lemma 7.8 to \(\Lambda^-\). The trick is to reduce to the case of \(\Gamma_{v,s}\).

**Lemma 7.13.** Suppose \(s \geq 1/3\) and suppose \(E\) is a Gieseker semistable sheaf with \(\chi(E) = v\). Then there is a \(\beta\) such that no actual \(\lambda\)-wall \(W_{u,v,s}\) intersects \(\Lambda^-\) at \((\pi, \beta)\) with \(\beta < \beta\).

**Proof.** By increasing \(-\beta\) we may assume the \(W_{u,v,s}\) crosses \(\Lambda^-\) in \(R_{v,s}^-\). By Theorem 6.11 any numerical \(\lambda\)-wall for \(s \geq 1/3\) remains a numerical \(\lambda\)-wall at \(s = 1/3\) and, since it is bounded, each component must intersect \(\Gamma_{v,1/3}\) at its maxima. Furthermore, if \(\Theta_{v-u}\) crosses \(\Lambda^-\) in \(R_{v,s}^-\) then it must also cross \(\Gamma_{v,s}^-\). Then we can argue as we did in Lemma 7.8 by dividing \(\Lambda^-\) into disjoint intervals where \(E\) alternates between stable and unstable. If the ends of an unstable interval are walls then the wall must intersect \(\Gamma_{v,s}^-\) twice because when \(s = 1/3\) it is a maximum and \(\Gamma_{v,1/3}\) is strictly monotonic decreasing. Similarly, the other combinations of \(\Theta_{v-u}\) and walls at the ends copy over to \(\Gamma_{v,s}^-\). The fact that no object can destabilize for all \(\beta < 0\) follows from the following lemma. \(\square\)

**Lemma 7.14.** For any fixed \(s > 0\) and \(\pi > 0\), if \(E\) is a Gieseker stable sheaf then there is no injection \(F \hookrightarrow E \rightarrow G\) in \(A^\pi,\beta\) with \(\lambda_{\pi,\beta,s}(F) \geq \lambda_{\pi,\beta,s}(E)\) for all \(\beta < \beta\).

**Proof.** If \(F \hookrightarrow E \rightarrow G\) is a short exact sequence in \(A^\pi,\beta\) for every \(\beta < \beta\), then Lemma 7.12 implies that both \(F\) and \(G\) are sheaves. We first have that

\[
\lim_{\beta \to -\infty} (\lambda_{\pi,\beta,s}(F) - \lambda_{\pi,\beta,s}(E)) = \frac{1}{3} \frac{\delta_{10}(F,E)}{\chi_0(F) \chi_0(E)} \leq 0,
\]

since \(\delta_{10}(F,E) \leq 0\) by hypothesis. If \(\delta_{10}(F,E) = 0\), then also

\[
\lim_{\beta \to -\infty} (-\beta)(\lambda_{\pi,\beta,s}(F) - \lambda_{\pi,\beta,s}(E)) = \frac{4}{3} \frac{\delta_{20}(F,E)}{\chi_0(F) \chi_0(E)} \leq 0,
\]

because \(\delta_{20}(F,E) \leq 0\). Finally, if \(\delta_{20}(F,E)\) also vanishes, then

\[
\lim_{\beta \to -\infty} \beta^2 (\lambda_{\pi,\beta,s}(F) - \lambda_{\pi,\beta,s}(E)) = \frac{4}{3} \frac{\delta_{30}(F,E)}{\chi_0(F) \chi_0(E)} \leq 0,
\]

since \(\delta_{30}(F,E) \leq 0\), with equality holding if and only if \(\delta_{30}(F,E) = 0\) as well, which implies that \(\lambda_{\pi,\beta,s}(F) = \lambda_{\pi,\beta,s}(E)\) for every \(\pi\), \(\beta\) and \(s\). It follows that \(E\) is asymptotically \(\lambda_{\pi,\beta,s}-(\text{semi})\)-stable, as desired. \(\square\)

This completes the proof of:

**Lemma 7.15.** For any \(s \geq 1/3\) and \(\pi > 0\), if \(E\) is a Gieseker (semi)stable sheaf, then \(E\) is asymptotically \(\lambda_{\pi,\beta,s}-(\text{semi})\)-stable along \(\Lambda^-\).

We now consider the converse.

**Lemma 7.16.** For any \(s > 0\) and \(\pi > 0\), if \(E\) is asymptotically \(\lambda_{\pi,\beta,s}-(\text{semi})\)-stable along \(\Lambda^-\), then \(E\) is a Gieseker (semi)stable sheaf.
Proof. If $E$ is asymptotically $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-(semi)stable along $\alpha = \pi$, then Lemma 7.12 implies that $E$ is a sheaf.

If $E$ is not torsion free, let $F \hookrightarrow E$ be its maximal torsion subsheaf; if $T \hookrightarrow F$ is a subsheaf of dimension 1, then $T \hookrightarrow E$ is a morphism in $\mathcal{A}^\beta$ for $\beta \ll 0$, since $T \in T_{\alpha,\beta}$ for every $(\alpha, \beta)$. We have that $\text{ch}_0(T) = \text{ch}_1(T) = 0$, thus

$$\lim_{\beta \to -\infty} \frac{-1}{\beta} (\lambda_{\pi,\beta,s}(T) - \lambda_{\pi,\beta,s}(E)) = \frac{2}{3} > 0,$$

provided $\text{ch}_2(T) \neq 0$, contradicting asymptotic $\lambda$-(semi)stability. If $\text{ch}(T) = (0, 0, 0, e)$, then it clearly destabilizes $E$ as well.

So now assume that $F$ has pure dimension 2, and let $T$ be its maximal $\mu$-semistable subsheaf. Remark 5.7 implies that $T \in \mathcal{A}^\beta$ for $\beta \ll 0$, thus $T \hookrightarrow E$ is a morphism in $\mathcal{A}^\beta$ in the same range. Since $\text{ch}_0(T) = 0$ and $\text{ch}_1(T) \neq 0$, then

$$\lim_{\beta \to -\infty} \frac{-1}{\beta} (\lambda_{\pi,\beta,s}(T) - \lambda_{\pi,\beta,s}(E)) = \frac{1}{6} > 0,$$

again contradicting asymptotic $\lambda$-(semi)stability. We therefore conclude that $E$ is torsion free.

If $E$ is not Gieseker semistable, let $F \hookrightarrow E$ be its maximal destabilizing subsheaf. As in the first part of the proof of Lemma 7.15 we can conclude that $F \in \mathcal{A}^\beta$ for $\beta \ll 0$, so $F \hookrightarrow E$ is a morphism in $\mathcal{A}^\beta$ in the same range.

It follows that

$$\lim_{\beta \to -\infty} (\lambda_{\pi,\beta,s}(F) - \lambda_{\pi,\beta,s}(E)) = \frac{1}{3} \frac{\delta_{\tau_0}(F, E)}{\text{ch}_0(F) \text{ch}_0(E)} \geq 0,$$

thus $\delta_{\tau_0}(F, E) = 0$ because $E$ is asymptotically $\lambda_{\pi,\beta,s}$-semistable. We then have that

$$\lim_{\beta \to -\infty} (-\beta)(\lambda_{\pi,\beta,s}(F) - \lambda_{\pi,\beta,s}(E)) = \frac{4}{3} \frac{\delta_{\tau_0}(F, E)}{\text{ch}_0(F) \text{ch}_0(E)} \geq 0,$$

thus again $\delta_{\tau_0}(F, E) = 0$. Finally, we have that

$$\lim_{\beta \to -\infty} \beta^2(\lambda_{\pi,\beta,s}(F) - \lambda_{\pi,\beta,s}(E)) = \frac{4}{3} \frac{\delta_{\tau_0}(F, E)}{\text{ch}_0(F) \text{ch}_0(E)} \geq 0,$$

thus $\delta_{\tau_0}(F, E) = 0$, meaning that $\text{ch}(F) = \text{ch}(E)$, contradicting the fact that $F$ is a proper subsheaf of $E$. We therefore conclude that $E$ must be Gieseker (semi)stable, as desired. \hfill \Box

7.3. Asymptotics along general unbounded $\Theta^-$-curves. We can now extend our results to any unbounded $\Theta^-$-curve (recall Definition 5.9).

Theorem 7.17. Let $\gamma$ be an unbounded $\Theta^-$-curve and fix $s \geq 1/3$. An object $E \in D^b(X)$ is asymptotically $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-(semi)stable along $\gamma$ if and only if $E$ is Gieseker (semi)stable.

Proof. We consider the stable case first and we deduce the semistable case by inducting on the lengths of the Jordan–Hölder filtrations.

The proof of Lemma 7.13 up to the last sentence goes over for $\gamma$ so long and we take large enough values for $t$. Lemma 7.14 will not work but we can deduce the version for $\gamma$ from this as follows. Suppose $E$ is Gieseker stable and $F \hookrightarrow E \rightarrow G$ is a short exact sequence in both $\mathcal{A}^\tau$ and $\text{Coh}(X)$ for all $t > t_0$, say and which is $\lambda$-destabilizing for all $t > t_0$. Pick some $t_1 > t_0$ and apply Lemma 7.14 to $\Lambda^-_{\alpha(t_1)}$. Then the wall $W_{\text{ch}(E), \text{ch}(F), s}$ must intersect $\Lambda^-_{\alpha(t_1)}$ an odd number of times.

for \( \beta < \beta(t_1) \). Hence, one of those must intersect \( \gamma(t) \) for \( t > t_1 \), a contradiction. This shows that if \( E \) is Gieseker stable then \( E \) is asymptotically \( \lambda \)-stable along \( \gamma \).

Conversely, if \( E \) is asymptotically \( \lambda \)-stable along \( \gamma \) and suppose it is not Gieseker stable. Then for all \( t \gg 0 \), \( E \) is not \( \lambda \)-stable along \( \Lambda_{\alpha(t)}^- \). Let \( t_0 \) be the least \( t \in \mathbb{R} \) such that \( E \) is \( \lambda \)-semistable in \( \mathcal{A}^{\gamma(t)} \) for all \( t < t_0 \). By increasing \( t_0 \) if necessary, we may assume that for each \( t > t_0 \) there is some \( F_t \) such that \( F_t \) destabilizes \( E \) at some \( \beta = \beta_1 < \beta(t) \) along \( \Lambda_{\alpha(t)}^- \) and such that \( \nu_{\alpha(t)}(F_t) > 0 \) (by the assumption that \( \gamma \) is a \( \Theta^- \)-curve and Lemma 5.12). So there must be a wall \( W_{\operatorname{ch}(E),\operatorname{ch}(F_t),s} \) which crosses the vertical line \( \beta = \beta_1 \). But that wall must cross either \( \Lambda_{\alpha(t)}^- \) at \( \beta < \beta_1 \) or \( \operatorname{Im}(\gamma) \) at \( \gamma(t') \) for some \( t' > t \). Since it remains an actual wall, the latter possibility cannot happen by the assumption on \( t_0 \). The former possibility means that there must be another \( F'_t \) which destabilizes at some \( (\alpha(t), \beta_1) \) with \( \beta_2 < \beta_1 \). Repeating we have an infinite sequence of such destabilizers which contradicts Lemma 7.8. \( \square \)

We can now deduce asymptotic conditions along unbounded curves in \( R^+_v \). Using the notion of unbounded \( \Theta^- \)-curve \( \gamma \) and of its dual path \( \gamma^* \) proposed in Definition 5.9, we state:

**Proposition 7.18.** Let \( \gamma \) be an unbounded \( \Theta^- \)-curve. Then \( E \) is asymptotically \( \lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}^- \)-(semi)stable along \( \gamma \) if and only if \( E^\vee \) is asymptotically \( \lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}^- \)-(semi)stable along \( \gamma^* \).

**Proof.** By Proposition 5.13, we know that there is a \( t_1 \) such that \( E^\vee \in \mathcal{A}^{\gamma^*(t)} \) for all \( t > t_1 \). If \( F \to E \) destabilizes \( E \) for all \( t > t_0 \) then the proposition also shows that there is some \( t_2 \) such that \( F^\vee \) and \( E^\vee \) are in \( \mathcal{A}^{\gamma^*(t)} \) for all \( t > t_2 \) and also \( E^\vee \to F^\vee \) surjects in \( \mathcal{A}^{\gamma^*(t)} \). But \( \lambda_{\gamma(t),s}(F) = -\lambda_{\gamma^*(t),s}(F^\vee) \). \( \square \)

Putting Theorem 7.17 and Proposition 7.18 together, we immediately deduce the following statement.

**Theorem 7.19.** Let \( v \) be a numerical Chern character satisfying \( v_0 \neq 0 \) and \( Q^{\lambda}(v) \geq 0 \), and fix \( \tau > 0 \). For each \( s \geq 1/3 \), an object \( A \in D^b(X) \) with \( \operatorname{ch}(A) = v \) is asymptotically \( \lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}^- \)-(semi)stable along an unbounded \( \Theta^+ \)-curve if and only if \( A^\vee \) is a Gieseker (semi)stable sheaf.

Since Theorem 7.13 holds for every \( s > 0 \), we have a stronger statement for the asymptotics along \( \Gamma_{v,s}^+ \).

**Theorem 7.20.** Let \( v \) be a numerical Chern character satisfying \( v_0 \neq 0 \) and \( Q^{\lambda}(v) \geq 0 \). For each \( s > 0 \), an object \( A \in D^b(X) \) is asymptotically \( \lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}^- \)-(semi)stable objects along \( \Gamma_{v,s}^+ \) if and only if \( A^\vee \) is a Gieseker (semi)stable sheaf.

Note that Proposition 2.15 provides an explicit characterization of objects \( A \in D^b(X) \) that are dual to torsion free sheaves.

8. **Examples of classifying walls: ideal sheaves and null correlation sheaves**

We complete this paper by studying some concrete examples of actual \( \lambda \)-walls and asymptotically \( \lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}^- \)-stable objects for \( X = \mathbb{P}^3 \) which illustrate many of the results established above.
8.1. **Ideal sheaves of lines in** $\mathbb{P}^3$. Let $L \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ be a line, and $I_L$ denote its ideal sheaf; recall that $v := \text{ch}(I_L) = (1, 0, -1, 1)$. The curves $\Theta_v$ and $\Gamma_{v,s}$ are given by

$$\Theta_v : \quad \beta^2 - \alpha^2 = 2$$

$$\Gamma_{v,s} : \quad \left(s + \frac{1}{6}\right) \beta \alpha^2 - \frac{\beta^3}{6} + \beta = -1$$

Note that $\Gamma_{v,s}$ intersects $\Theta_v$ for every $s > 0$ at a single point, call it $P_s$, whose $\beta$ coordinate is the real root of the polynomial $3s\beta^3 + (2 - 6s)\beta + 3 = 0$; the case $s = 1/3$ is pictured in Figure 2.

Theorem 4.22 guarantees the existence of vanishing $\nu$- and $\lambda$-walls, which are precisely given by the triangle

$$2O_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \to I_L \to O_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-2)[1].$$

We simplify the notation and use $\Xi := \Xi_{u,v}$ and $\Upsilon_s := \Upsilon_{u,v,s}$, where $u = \text{ch}(O_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1))$, for the vanishing $\nu$- and $\lambda$-walls just described, respectively.

Both curves cut $\Theta_v$ at the point $R := \Theta_v \cap \Xi \cap \Upsilon_s = (\alpha = 1/2, \beta = 3/2)$. In addition, the vanishing $\lambda$-wall crosses $\Gamma_{v,s}$ at the point $Q_s := \Gamma_{v,s} \cap \Upsilon_s = (1/\sqrt{6s + 1}, -2)$.

There are no other actual $\nu$-walls for the numerical Chern vector $v = (1, 0, -1, 1)$. To see that, suppose $A \to I_L$ is a $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}$-stable destabilizing object in $\mathcal{B}^3$ then it must destabilize along $\beta = -\sqrt{2}$ and also on $\Theta_v$. Let $\text{ch}_{\leq 2}(A) = (r, -c, d)$ then $r > 0$ and the condition that both $A$ and $I_L/A \in \mathcal{B}^3$ gives us

$$-c - \beta r < -\beta$$

$$c - \beta (1 - r) < -\beta$$

and so $\beta r < -c < \beta(r - 1)$. For $\beta = \sqrt{2}$ we see that $c = r$ is the only solution. Then the first inequality implies $r < \beta/(1 + \beta) = \sqrt{2}/(\sqrt{2} - 1)$ and so $0 < r \leq 3$. Now choosing $\beta$ on $\Theta_v$, we have $d + \beta c + r = 0$ in order for $A$ to destabilize $I_L$. So $d = -r(\beta + 1) > r(\sqrt{2} - 1)$. On the other hand, the Bogomolov inequality for $A$ gives $r^2 \geq 2rd$ and so $d \leq r/2$. Then $d = r/2$ as it must be in $\mathbb{Z}[1/2]$.
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**Figure 9.** The vanishing $\nu$- and $\lambda$-walls (in purple and black, respectively) for the ideal sheaf of a line. Note that the $\lambda$-wall is connected but possesses two irreducible components. Both curves intersect $\Theta_v$ (in blue) an $\Gamma_{v,s}$ (in red).
We argue that no other actual $\lambda$-wall intersects $\Gamma_{v,s}$. Indeed, every numerical $\lambda$-wall must pass through the point $P_s = \Gamma_{v,s} \cap \Theta_s$, see Lemma 4.5. In addition, it cannot cross $\Theta_s$ at a point above the point $R$, because that would imply the existence of another numerical $\nu$-wall larger than $\Xi$, by Lemma 6.13. It follows that every numerical $\lambda$-wall must cut $\Upsilon_s$ either at the point $R$, or at the point $Q_s$, or somewhere between between these points.

If a numerical $\lambda$-wall crossed $\Gamma_{v,s}$ above $Q_s$ and then again at $Q_s$, then Lemma 6.13 would force the existence of a numerical $\nu$-wall containing $\Xi$.

If $\Upsilon_{u',v,s}$ is another numerical $\lambda$-wall for $v$ crossing $\Theta_s$ at the point $R$, then $\chi_{\leq 2}(u') \propto \chi_{\leq 2}(u)$, again by Lemma 4.5. If the point $R$ is an actual $\lambda$-wall in $\Upsilon_{u',v,s}$, then there is an $\lambda_{1/2,-3/2,s}$-semistable object $A$ destabilizing $I_L[1]$ in $A^{1/2,-3/2}$, and $A[-1]$ must be a $\nu_{1/2,-3/2,s}$-semistable object in $B^{-3/2}$ destabilizing $I_L$. Since $\chi(A) = (k,-k,k/2,a)$, we have that $\chi_{1/2}^{-3/2}(A[-1]) = -k/2$, so $k \leq 0$. Applying the generalised Bogomolov inequality (4), we obtain $Q_{1/2,-3/2}(A[-1]) = -k(k+6a)/2 \geq 0$, which implies $a \geq 0$. One can then check that the intersection $\Upsilon_{u',v,s} \cap \Gamma_{v,s}$ consists only of the point $P_s$.

The only possibility left is that of a numerical $\lambda$-wall $\Upsilon_{u',v,s}$ that cuts $\Gamma_{v,s}$ above $Q_s$ and also crosses $\Upsilon_s$ strictly between $Q_s$ and $R$. However, the actual $\lambda$-wall $W_{u',v,s} \subset \Upsilon_{u',v,s}$ cannot intersect $\Upsilon_s$. Indeed, let $p$ be the point of intersection $\Upsilon_{u',v,s} \cap \Upsilon_s$, and let $F \hookrightarrow I_L \to G$ be the exact sequence in $A^p$ that defines $W_{u',v,s}$; note that

$$\lambda_{p,s}(F) = \lambda_{p,s}(O_{p3}(-2)[1]) = \lambda_{p,s}(I_L).$$

Since $O_{p3}(-2)[1]$ is $\lambda_{p,s}$ stable, the induced morphism $F \to O_{p3}(-2)[1]$ either vanishes or is an isomorphism. The second possibility is absurd, since there is no monomorphism from $O_{p3}(-2)[1]$ into $I_L$. It follows that $F$ must be a subobject of $O_{p3}(-1)$ within $A^p$, thus either $F \simeq O_{p3}(-1)$ or $F \simeq 2O_{p3}(-1)$; both situations imply that $\Upsilon_{u',v,s} \cap \Upsilon_s$ providing a contradiction.

We conclude that it is possible to circle around the actual $\lambda$-wall $W_{u',v,s} \subset \Upsilon_{u',v,s}$ while remaining within $R^\nu_v$, giving a path from just above $Q_v' := v' \cap \Gamma_{v,s}$ to just below this same point which does not cross any actual $\lambda$-walls, which contradicts the fact that $Q_v'$ is an actual $\lambda$-wall.

We summarize our discussion with the following result.

**Theorem 8.1.** For each $(\alpha, \beta) \in R^\nu_v$ with $\beta < -2$, there is $s > 0$ such that the ideal sheaf of a line in $P^3$ is $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-stable.

**Proof:** Just note that given $(\alpha_0, \beta_0) \in R^\nu_v$, there is an $s$ such that the curve $\Gamma_{v,s}$ goes through $(\alpha_0, \beta_0)$. The arguments above establish that the only actual $\lambda$-wall along $\Gamma_{v,s}$ occurs when $\beta = -2$. $\square$

### 8.2. Ideal sheaves of points in $P^3$

Let $p \in P^3$ be a point, and $I_p$ denote its ideal sheaf; recall that $v := \text{ch}(I_p) = (1,0,0,-1)$. The curves $\Theta_v$ and $\Gamma_{v,s}$ are given by

$$\Theta_v : \beta^2 - \alpha^2 = 0$$

$$\Gamma_{v,s} : \left(s + \frac{1}{6}\right) \beta \alpha^2 - \frac{\beta^3}{6} = 1$$

Note that $\Gamma_{v,s}$ does not intersect $\Theta_v$.

The resolution of $I_p$ induces two triangles: the first one defines a reflexive sheaf $S_p$ with $u := \text{ch}(S_p) = (2, -3, 3/2, 1/2)$ whose only singularity is precisely the point
Figure 10. This graph shows the numerical $\lambda$-walls $\Upsilon_{w,u,s}$ (in purple) and $\Upsilon_{w,v,s}$ (in black) and the curve $\Gamma_{v,s}$ (in red) crossing at the point $(\alpha = 1/\sqrt{3}, \beta = -2); \text{ we set } s = 1/3$. The shaded region marks where the objects $O(-3)[2]$, $O(-2)[1]$ and $O(-1)$, and consequently also $S_p[1]$ and $I_p$, belong to $A^{\alpha,\beta}$.

\begin{align}
3\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-2)[1] & \rightarrow S_p[1] \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-3)[2]; \\
3\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) & \rightarrow I_p \rightarrow S_p[1].
\end{align}

The objects $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-3)[2]$, $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-2)[1]$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1)$ all belong to $A^{\alpha,\beta}$ for every $(\alpha,\beta)$ within a square with vertices at the points $(\alpha = 0, \beta = -2), (\alpha = 1/2, \beta = -3/2), (\alpha = 1, \beta = -2), (\alpha = 1/2, \beta = -5/2)$. Within this region, the two triangles induce actual $\lambda$-walls $\Upsilon_{w,u,s}$, where $w := \text{ch}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-2)[1])$, and $\Upsilon_{u,v,s}$. One can check that $\Upsilon_{w,u,s}$ and $\Upsilon_{u,v,s}$ intersect at the point $(\alpha = 1/\sqrt{6}s + 1, \beta = -2)$, which also belongs to $\Gamma_{v,s}$, for every $s$, implying that the sheaf $I_p$ is a $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-stable object at that point; see Figure 10 below.

It follows that there exists an open set $V \subset \mathbb{H}$ containing the point $(\alpha = 1/\sqrt{6}s + 1, \beta = -2)$ in its boundary such that $I_p$ is a $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-stable object for every $(\alpha,\beta) \in V$. Moreover, $\Upsilon_{u,v,s}$ is a vanishing $\lambda$-wall for $I_p$.

Since $I_p$ is also asymptotically $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-stable along $\Gamma_{v,s}$, it seems reasonable to conjecture that $I_p$ is $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-stable for every $(\alpha,\beta) \in \Gamma_{v,s}$ with $\beta < -2$ (that is, no actual $\lambda$-wall crosses $\Gamma_{v,s}$ for $\beta < -2$).

8.3. **Torsion free sheaves with Chern character $(2,0,-1,0)$**. Our first step towards the classification of $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-semistable objects with Chern character $v = (2,0,-1,0)$ on $\mathbb{P}^3$ near the curve $\Gamma_{v,s}$ is the classification of $\mu$-semistable torsion free sheaves with this Chern character.

Below, $p$ and $L$ respectively denote a point and a line in $\mathbb{P}^3$. Recall also that torsion free $E$ on $\mathbb{P}^3$ is called a *null correlation sheaf* if it satisfies the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \rightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}^3}^1(1) \rightarrow E \rightarrow 0,$$
see [12]. Note that \( \text{ch}(E) = (2,0,-1,0) \). A locally free null correlation sheaf is called a null correlation bundle; non locally free null correlation sheaves satisfy a sequence of the form
\[
0 \to E \to 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \to \mathcal{O}_L(1) \to 0
\]
for some line \( L \subset \mathbb{P}^3 \).

**Proposition 8.2.** Let \( E \) be a \( \mu \)-semistable torsion free sheaf on \( X = \mathbb{P}^3 \) with \( \text{ch}(E) = (2,0,-1,0) \).

1. If \( E \) is locally free, then \( E \) is a null correlation bundle; in particular, \( E \) is \( \mu \)-stable.
2. If \( E \) is properly torsion free, then \( E \) is strictly \( \mu \)-semistable and it is given by one of the following extensions:
   1. \( 0 \to I_L \to E \to I_p \to 0 \) for \( p \in L \) with nontrivial extension; in particular, \( E \) is a null correlation sheaf and it is \( \mu_{\leq 2} \)-stable;
   2. \( 0 \to I_p \to E \to I_L \to 0 \) for arbitrary \( p \) and \( L \); in particular, \( E \) is not \( \mu_{\leq 2} \)-semistable and it has no global sections;
   3. \( 0 \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \to E \to I_L \to 0 \), where \( L \) is a 1-dimensional scheme satisfying the sequence \( 0 \to \mathcal{O}_p \to \mathcal{O}_L \to \mathcal{O}_L \to 0 \) for arbitrary \( p \) and \( L \); in particular, \( E \) is not \( \mu_{\leq 2} \)-semistable and it has a global section.

Note that \( \text{Ext}^1(I_L, I_p) = 0 \) when \( p \notin L \).

**Proof.** If \( E \) is locally free, then [11, Lemma 2.1] implies that \( E \) is \( \mu \)-stable; the fact that every \( \mu \)-stable rank 2 bundle \( E \) with \( c_2(E) = 1 \) on \( \mathbb{P}^3 \) is a null correlation bundle is proved in [20, 4.3.2, page 363].

If \( E \) is not locally free, then \( E^{**} \) is a \( \mu \)-semistable rank 2 reflexive sheaf with \( \text{ch}_1(E^{**}) = 0 \) and either \( \text{ch}_2(E^{**}) = 0 \) or \( \text{ch}_2(E^{**}) = 1 \); in both cases, \( E^{**} \) is strictly \( \mu \)-semistable (cf. [11, Lemma 2.1]), so \( E \) is strictly \( \mu \)-semistable. The first case forces \( E^{**} = 2 \cdot \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \), while, in the second case, \( E^{**} \) must be a properly reflexive sheaf \( S_L \) given by the sequence
\[
0 \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \to S_L \to I_L \to 0;
\]
note that \( \text{ch}(S_L) = (2,0,-1,1) \).

We start by analysing the first case, that is \( E^{**} = 2 \cdot \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \). We have that \( \text{ch}(Q_E) = (0,0,1,0) \) where \( Q_E := E^{**}/E \); note that \( h^0(E) = 0,1 \). Again, two possibilities follow: either \( Q_E \) has pure dimension 1, in which case \( Q_E = \mathcal{O}_L(1) \), or \( Q_E \) satisfies a sequence of the form
\[
0 \to Z \to Q_E \to O_L(k) \to 0,
\]
where \( Z \) is a 0-dimensional sheaf, and \( k - 1 = -h^0(Z) < 0 \) because \( \text{ch}_3(O_L(k)) = -\text{ch}_3(Z) \); since \( h^0(O_L(k)) > 0 \), we must have \( k = 0 \) and thus \( Z = \mathcal{O}_p \).

The first possibility, namely \( Q_E = \mathcal{O}_L(1) \), leads to the sequence
\[
0 \to E \to 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \to \mathcal{O}_L(1) \to 0
\]
and therefore yields the sheaves described in item (2.1), since \( I_L \) is the kernel of the composition \( \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \to 2 \cdot \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \to \mathcal{O}_L(1) \). In addition, notice that these are the null correlation sheaves. Checking that these sheaves are \( \mu_{\geq 2} \)-stable is a simple exercise.

The second possibility leads to the sequence
\[
0 \to E \to 2\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \to \mathcal{O}_L \to 0
\]
and therefore yields the sheaves described in item (2.3).
Finally, if $E^{**} = S_L$, then $Q_E = O_p$, and the sequence $0 \to E \to S_L \to O_p \to 0$ together with the sequence \eqref{eq:52} lead to the sequence in item (2.2).

It is important to notice that nontrivial extensions like the ones in items (2.2) and (2.3) of Proposition\ref{prop:8.2} do exist. Let us first consider the extension of an ideal sheaf of a line by an ideal sheaf of a point.

**Lemma 8.3.** If $p$ is a point and $L$ is a line in $\mathbb{P}^3$, then

$$ \dim \text{Ext}^1(I_L, I_p) = \begin{cases} 
3 & \text{if } p \notin L; \\
5 & \text{if } p \in L. 
\end{cases} $$

**Proof.** First, apply the functor $\text{Hom}(\cdot, I_p)$ to the exact sequence $0 \to I_L \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \to \mathcal{O}_L \to 0$ to conclude that $\text{Ext}^1(I_L, I_p) \simeq \text{Ext}^2(\mathcal{O}_L, I_p)$. Applying the functor $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_L, -)$ to the exact sequence $0 \to I_p \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3} \to \mathcal{O}_p \to 0$ we obtain

$$ (53) \quad 0 \to \text{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_L, \mathcal{O}_p) \to \text{Ext}^2(\mathcal{O}_L, I_p) \to \text{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_L, \mathcal{O}_p) \to 0. $$

Note that $\text{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}_L, \mathcal{O}_p) = H^0(\mathcal{E}xt^i(\mathcal{O}_L, \mathcal{O}_p))$. If $p \notin L$, then $\mathcal{E}xt^i(\mathcal{O}_L, \mathcal{O}_p) = 0$ for every $i \geq 0$, thus $\text{Ext}^1(I_L, I_p) \simeq H^1(\mathcal{O}_L(-4))$, which completes the proof of the first claim.

If $p \in L$, then one can check that

$$ h^0(\mathcal{E}xt^i(\mathcal{O}_L, \mathcal{O}_p)) = \begin{cases} 
2 & \text{for } i = 1; \\
1 & \text{for } i = 2. 
\end{cases} $$

Comparing with the exact sequence in display \eqref{eq:53}, we obtain the second part of the statement. \hfill \Box

Next we consider the sheaves in item (2.3) of Proposition\ref{prop:8.2}.

**Lemma 8.4.** If $\tilde{L}$ is the 1-dimensional scheme described in item (2.3) of Proposition\ref{prop:8.2}, then $\dim \text{Ext}^1(I_{\tilde{L}}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}) = 1$.

**Proof.** Note that

$$ \text{Ext}^1(I_{\tilde{L}}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}) \simeq H^2(I_{\tilde{L}}(-4))^* \simeq H^2(I_{\tilde{L}}(-4))^*, $$

where the first isomorphism is given by Serre duality, and the second follows from the sequence $0 \to I_{\tilde{L}} \to I_L \to \mathcal{O}_p \to 0$.

The resolution of the ideal sheaf $I_{\tilde{L}}$ yields the cohomology sequence

$$ 0 \to H^2(I_{\tilde{L}}(-4)) \to H^3(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-6)) \to H^3(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-5))^{\oplus 2} \to H^3(I_{\tilde{L}}(-4)) \to 0; $$

however, $H^3(I_{\tilde{L}}(-4)) \simeq \text{Hom}(I_{\tilde{L}}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3})^*$, thus $h^2(I_{\tilde{L}}(-4)) = 1$. \hfill \Box

Now let $\mathcal{G}$ denote the Grassmanian of lines in $\mathbb{P}^3$. Recall that a line $L \in \mathcal{G}$ is called a \textit{jumping line} for a $\mu$-semistable torsion free sheaf $E$ with $\text{ch}_1(E) = 0$ on $\mathbb{P}^3$ if $E \otimes \mathcal{O}_L = \mathcal{O}_L(-a) \oplus \mathcal{O}_L(a)$ for some $a > 0$; we denote by $\mathcal{J}(E)$ the set of jumping lines for $E$, as a subset of $\mathcal{G}$.

If $E$ is a null correlation sheaf, then $\mathcal{J}(E)$ is a divisor of degree 1 in $\mathcal{G}$. Therefore, for each null correlation sheaf $E$ and $L \in \mathcal{J}(E)$ there exists an epimorphism $E \to \mathcal{O}_L(-1)$, whose kernel is a Gieseker semistable sheaf $K$ with $\text{ch}(K) = (2, 0, -2, 2)$.

Such sheaves have been previously considered by Miró-Roig and Trautmann in \cite{28} Section 1.5; they showed that the family of sheaves $K$ defined by exact sequences of the form

$$ 0 \to K \to E \to \mathcal{O}_L(-1) \to 0 $$
where $E$ is a null correlation sheaf and $L \in J(E)$, define a locally closed 8-dimensional subscheme of the full moduli space of Gieseker semistable sheaves on $\mathbb{P}^3$ with Chern character equal to $(2, 0, -2, 2)$. In addition, this moduli space, which we will simply denote by $Z$, is an irreducible projective variety of dimension 13, and every such sheaf satisfies an exact sequence of the form

$$(54) \quad 0 \to 2O_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-2) \xrightarrow{A} 4O_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-1) \to K \to 0,$$

with $A$ being a $4 \times 2$ matrix of linear forms in 4 variables.

Below it will be important to describe the set of pairs $(K, L) \in Z \times G$ for which non-trivial extensions of $K$ by $O_L(-1)$ exist; we consider the set

$$(55) \quad J := \{(K, L) \in Z \times G \mid \operatorname{Ext}^1(K, O_L(-1)) \neq 0\}.$$

**Lemma 8.5.** $J$ is a divisor in $Z \times G$. In addition, the natural projection $J \to Z$ is surjective, and its fibres are quadric hypersurfaces in $G$.

In particular, $J$ is an irreducible projective variety of dimension 16.

**Proof.** Applying the functor $\operatorname{Hom}(-, O_L(-1))$ to sequence in display (54) we obtain

$$0 \to \operatorname{Hom}(K, O_L(-1)) \to H^0(O_L)^{\oplus 4} \to H^0(O_L(1))^{\oplus 2} \to \operatorname{Ext}^1(K, O_L(-1)) \to 0,$$

thus $\dim \operatorname{Ext}^1(K, O_L(-1)) = \dim \operatorname{Hom}(K, O_L(-1))$ for every $L \in G$.

However, $\operatorname{Hom}(K, O_L(-1)) \neq 0$ precisely when $L$ is a jumping line for $K$. According to [26, Lemma 3.10.1], for each $K \in Z$ the set of jumping lines for $K$ is a divisor of degree 2 in $G$.

Finally, observe also that $\dim \operatorname{Ext}^1(K, O_L(-1)) \leq 4$, depending on the rank of the map $H^0(O_L)^{\oplus 4} \to H^0(O_L(1))^{\oplus 2}$ which is given by the restriction of the matrix $A$ to the line $L$.

Our next goal in this section is the classification of $\nu_{\alpha, \beta}$-stable objects for the Chern character $v = (-2, 0, 1, 0)$. First, we show that there are no $\nu$-walls.

**Lemma 8.6.** For $v = \pm(2, 0, -1, k)$ there are no actual $\nu$-walls for any $k$.

**Proof.** We suppose first that $\beta < 0$. Then we may assume $E$ is a Gieseker semistable sheaf (to find the biggest wall). Suppose $F$ is a subobject of $E$ in $\mathcal{B}^3$ with $\nu_\beta(F) = \nu_\beta(E)$ and $\operatorname{ch}(F) = (r, x, y/2, z/6)$. Then $r \geq 1$ and $x \leq 0$. By [26, Corollary 2.8], every $\nu$-wall must cross $\beta = \mu(E) - \sqrt{\Delta(E)/r(E)}^2 = -1$ (at the bottom of $\Theta_\alpha$) and so $0 < x + r < 2$ and then $x = 1 - r$. We look for $\nu$-walls along $\Theta_\alpha$. Then $\alpha^2 = \beta^2 - 1$. Now $\Delta_{\nu_\beta}(F) = y/2 - \beta(1-r) + r/2 = 0$. So $y = 2\beta(1-r) - r$. If $r \geq 2$ then $y \geq r - 1$ as $\beta < -1$. From Bogomolov for $F$ we have $(r-1)^2 \geq ry \geq r(r-1)$ which is impossible. So $r = 1$. Then $y = -1$ but $x = 0$ and $(1, 0, -1/2, z/6)$ is not the Chern character of a sheaf.

Now we assume $\beta > 0$. Then $E$ is a dual of a Gieseker semistable sheaf. Suppose $F \to E \to G$ is a short exact sequence in $\mathcal{B}^3$ with $\nu(F) = \nu(E) = \nu(G)$ for some $\alpha$. If $E$ is a sheaf then so is $G$ and $G^\vee \in \mathcal{B}^3$ with $\nu_{\alpha, -\beta}(G^\vee) = -\nu_{\alpha, -\beta}(G)$. But then $F^\vee$ is also a sheaf and so $E^\vee$ is not tilt stable but this contradicts the last paragraph. If $E$ is not a sheaf then $\mathcal{H}^0(G)$ is a quotient of $O_L(1)$ and since we may assume $G$ is tilt-semistable, it follows condition (6) of Proposition 2.15 holds and $\mathcal{H}^{-1}(G)$ is reflexive (any torsion sheaf $T$ with a map $T[1] \to \mathcal{H}^{-1}(G) \to G$ injects). Since $S = 0$ in Proposition 2.15 it follows that $G$ is the dual of a torsion free sheaf and again $F^\vee$ is a sheaf. So we still have a contradiction.\[\square\]
The previous lemma has two interesting applications. First we recover the following stronger version of a well known fact.

**Proposition 8.7.** If $k > 0$ is an integer then there are no $\mu \leq 2$-semistable torsion free sheaves of Chern character $(2, 0, -1, k)$ on $\mathbb{P}^3$.

**Proof.** Note that $q(v) = 8(2 - 9k^2) < 0$. Then if there are $\mu \leq 2$-semistable torsion free sheaves there must exist an actual vanishing $v$-wall by Theorem 4.22. But there are no $v$-walls.

Note that $S_L$ in the proof of Proposition 8.2 is an example of a $\mu$-semistable reflexive sheaf of Chern character $(2, 0, -1, 2)$. In addition, let $E$ be a null correlation bundle, and let $\{p_1, \ldots, p_k\}$ be distinct points in $\mathbb{P}^3$: the kernel of an epimorphism $E \to \bigoplus_{i=1}^k \mathcal{O}_{p_i}$ provides an example of a $\mu$-stable torsion free sheaf with Chern character $(2, 0, -1, -k)$ for any $k > 0$.

One can also provide a complete description of $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}$-stable objects with Chern character $(2, 0, -1, 0)$.

**Proposition 8.8.** Given any $\alpha > 0$, an object $B \in \mathcal{B}^\alpha(\mathbb{P}^3)$ with $\text{ch}(B) = (2, 0, -1, 0)$ is $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}$-stable if and only if

1. $B$ is a null correlation sheaf, when $\beta < 0$;
2. $B'[-1]$ is a null correlation sheaf, when $\beta > 0$.

**Proof.** Theorem 5.2 and Proposition 8.2 tell us that the asymptotically $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}$-stable objects on each side of the $\alpha$-axis are precisely the ones described above. Since there are no actual $\nu$-walls, such objects are $\nu_{\alpha,\beta}$-stable everywhere.

### 8.4. $\lambda$-walls and stability for the Chern character $(2, 0, -1, 0)$

We now turn to the classification of $\lambda$-walls and the description of the $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-semistable objects with Chern character $v = (2, 0, -1, 0)$ along the curve $\Gamma_{v,s}$.

The general strategy to locate all actual $\lambda$-walls along an unbounded curve, is the following. First, one classifies the asymptotically $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-semistable objects along the desired curve. Assume that $E$ is asymptotically $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta,s}$-stable, we then attempt to find walls which destabilize $E$. We then work down through the walls from the largest and increase the search to include all new objects which arise as we cross $\lambda$-walls.

Note that the fact that both $I_L$ and $I_B$ are $\lambda_{1/\sqrt{6s + 1}, -2,0,s}$-semistable for every $s > 0$, checked in Sections 8.1 and 8.2, imply that the sheaves of type (2.1) and (2.2) are also $\lambda_{1/\sqrt{6s + 1}, -2,0,s}$-semistable for every $s > 0$. For this case we will set $s = 1/3$ for simplicity.

For $E$ with $\text{ch}(E) = (2, 0, -1, 0)$ we consider a short exact sequence

$$0 \to F \to E \to G \to 0$$

with $\lambda_{\alpha,\beta}(F) = \lambda_{\alpha,\beta}(E)$ along $\Gamma_{v,s}$. We let $\text{ch}(F) = (r, x, y/2, z/6)$ for integers $r, x, y, z$. Since $\chi(F) = r + 11x/6 + y + z/6$ is an integer, we must have $6|(z - x)$. Note that the constraints on $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are

$$\alpha^2 = \frac{\beta^2 - 3}{6s + 1} = \frac{1}{3} \beta^2 - 1,$$

when $s = 1/3$, and $\beta < -\sqrt{3}$. We have $\text{ch}^{\alpha,\beta}(E) = \frac{2}{3} \beta^2$,

$$\text{ch}^{\alpha,\beta}(F) = \frac{y}{2} - \beta x + \frac{1}{3} \beta^2 r + \frac{1}{2} r$$
and

$$\text{ch}_2^{\alpha, \beta}(G) = -\frac{y}{2} + \beta x - \frac{1}{3} \beta^2 (r - 2) - \frac{1}{2} r,$$

Since $F \in T_B$ we have $x > \beta r$. Finally, we have that $\lambda_{\alpha, \beta, 1/3}(F) = 0$ which gives

$$z = -2x\beta^2 + 3(r + y)\beta - 3x.$$

Lemma 7.6 constrains $F$ and $G$ to two cases. We can refine it to eliminate case (2) of that lemma:

**Lemma 8.9.** Given $E, F$ and $G$ as above then $F, G \in B^\beta$.

**Proof.** From $0 < \text{ch}_2^{\alpha, \beta}(F) < \text{ch}_2^{\alpha, \beta}(E) = 2\beta^2/3$, we have

$$\beta x < \frac{y}{2} + \frac{1}{3} \beta^2 r + \frac{r}{2} < \beta x + \frac{2}{3} \beta^2,$$

and from $0 < -\text{ch}_2^{\alpha, \beta}(G[-1]) < \text{ch}_2^{\alpha, \beta}(E)$ we have

$$\beta x + \frac{2}{3} \beta^2 < \frac{y}{2} + \frac{1}{3} \beta^2 r + \frac{r}{2},$$

which is impossible. □

Combining this with Proposition 8.6, we deduce that $\Delta_{21}(\text{ch}(E), \text{ch}(F)) \geq 0$ (with equality only if it holds for all $\beta$) which gives the inequality

$$(56) \quad y - \frac{4}{3} \beta x + r \leq 0.$$  

Another useful consequence of Proposition 8.6 is that $Y_{(2, 0, -1, 0)} = \emptyset$ in Proposition 4.3 and the above Lemma then provides us with a useful necessary condition on $u$.

**Lemma 8.10.** For $v = (2, 0, -1, 0)$ if $u$ is the Chern character corresponding to an actual $\lambda$-wall in $R^L_{v,s}$ satisfying $x \neq 0$ then $|y + r| \leq 2|x|$.

**Proposition 8.11.** Consider $v = (2, 0, -1, 0)$. Then on $X = \mathbb{P}^3$ there are exactly four pseudo $\lambda$-walls for $v$ intersecting $\Gamma_{v, 1/3}^{-}$ given by

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_L \rightarrow E \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_p \rightarrow 0 \quad (57)$$

$$0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow E \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_L(-1) \rightarrow 0 \quad (58)$$

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(-1) \rightarrow E \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_C(1) \rightarrow 0 \quad (59)$$

$$0 \rightarrow S_p(1) \rightarrow E \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_p/H \rightarrow 0, \quad (60)$$

where $L$ is a line, $C$ is the union of two lines on a quadric surface in $\mathbb{P}^3$ and $H$ is a hyperplane; moreover, $K$ is a Gieseker semistable sheaf with $\text{ch}(K) = (2, 0, -2, 2)$ as described in display (54). The first two are coincident and the first three are actual $\lambda$-walls below $\Gamma_{v, 1/3}^{-}$ while only (59) is actual above $\Gamma_{v, 1/3}^{-}$.

**Proof.** We look for the actual $\lambda$-wall for a given object $E$ with $\text{ch}(E) = v$ furthest to the left along $\Gamma_{v, 1/3}^{-}$, so that we can assume $E$ is a Gieseker stable torsion free sheaf. In fact, we shall only assume the weaker condition that $E$ is a $\mu$-semistable torsion free sheaf. These are classified by Proposition 8.2. Once we have found the walls for these we need to also consider new objects which become $\lambda$-stable as we cross each wall.
Note that \( r = 1 \) or \( r = 2 \) and so \( x \leq 0 \) as \( E \) is \( \mu \)-semistable and rank 2. Consider the case \( r = 1 \) first. Then the conditions on \( \text{ch}_2^{α,β}(F) \) and the Bogomolov inequalities for \( F \) and \( G \) give

\[
\beta x - \frac{1}{3} \beta^2 < \frac{y+1}{2} < \beta x + \frac{1}{3} \beta^2
\]

and

\[
-\frac{x^2 + 1}{2} \leq \frac{y+1}{2} \leq \frac{x^2 + 1}{2}.
\]

These intervals overlap if and only if

\[
x > \beta + \sqrt{\frac{\beta^2 - 3}{3}}.
\]

From this it follows that for \( \beta < -(\sqrt{6} + 6)/2, x = 0 \) or \( x = -1 \). We treat these cases first.

**Case** \( (1, 0, y/2, z/6) \). Suppose \( x = 0 \). Then Bogomolov for \( F \) and \( G \) gives \(-2 \leq y \leq 0 \). But \( y = -1 \) is impossible as \( F \) must be a torsion free sheaf. So \( y = -2 \) or \( y = 0 \). Then the destabilizing condition gives \( z = -3β \) or \( z = 3β \) respectively. The condition on \( F \) then implies that \( \beta \) is \(-2k \) for some positive integer \( k \). Now the generalized Bogomolov inequality for \( F \) gives

\[
\frac{8}{3} \beta^2 + 2 + zβ \geq 0
\]

so that \( k^2 \leq 3/2 \) and then \( k = 1 \). This gives the first wall (57).

**Case** \( (1, -1, y/2, z/6) \). Now suppose \( x = -1 \). The constraints on \( y \) gives \(-3 \leq y \leq 1 \) but \( F \) is a rank one torsion free sheaf and so \( y \equiv x \pmod{2} \). Then we have three cases: \( y = -3, -1, 1 \).

**Case** \( (1, -1, -1/2, z/6) \). Consider first \( y = -1 \). From the bounds on \( (y + 1)/2 \) we have \( \beta > -β^2/3 \) and so \( β^3 < -3β^2 \). But \( z = 3 + 2β^2 \) and hence \( 0 \leq Q(F) = 2β^3 + 14β^2/3 - β + 2 < -4β^2/3 - β + 2 < 4β - β + 2 = 3β + 2 \) so that \( \beta > -2/3 \). But \( \beta < -\sqrt{3} \) and so we do not get a wall.

**Case** \( (1, -1, -3/2, z/6) \). Now assume \( y = -3 \). Then \(-β - β^2/3 < -1 \) and so \( β < -3/2 - \sqrt{21}/2 \approx -3.79 \). We also have \( z = 2β^2 - 6β + 3 \) and then \( Q(F) = 2β^3 + 4β^2/3 - 6β + 8 \). This has one real root \( β_0 \approx -2.503 \). So \( Q(F) < 0 \) for the range of \( β \) for which \( F \in B^2 \). hence, this case does not occur.

**Case** \( (1, -1, 1/2, z/6) \). Finally, we consider \( y = 1 \). Then \( z = 3 + 6β + 2β^2 \) and so \( Q(F) = 2β^3 + 8β^2 + 10β + 4 = 2(β + 1)^2(β + 2) \). So we require \(-2 \leq β < -\sqrt{3} \). Since, \( χ(F) \) is an integer, we have \( 6|z + 1 \) and so \( z = 6n - 1 \) for some integer \( n \). From the expression for \( z \) in terms of \( β \) we have \( β = (-3 - \sqrt{12n + 1})/2 \) and this is in the required range only for \( n = 0 \). So \( z = -1 \). This gives \( F = O(-1) \) and provides us with the second sequence (59) of the proposition. Note that \( β = -2 \) again.
Case (1, \(\leq -2, y/2, z/6\)). Now we assume \(x \leq -2\). Note that \(2x - 1 \leq y \leq -1 - 2x\). We also have \(\beta < -(\sqrt{6} + 6)/2 \approx -4.22\). From this it follows that \(\sqrt{(\beta^2 - 3)/3} > -\beta/2\) and so \(x > \beta/2\). Then we have \(4 \leq x^2 < \beta x/2 < \beta^2/4\). On the other hand, \(x \leq (y + 1)/2 \leq -x\) and so this overlaps with \(\beta x - \beta^2/3 < (y + 1)/2 < \beta x + \beta^2/3\) if \((\beta + 1)x > \beta^2/3\). But then \(x < \beta/3\) and so \(\beta x > \beta^2/3\). Note that if \(\beta x - \beta^2/3x\) then \(x(\beta - 1) < \beta^2/3\) and so \(x > \beta/3\) which is false. So \(0 > \beta x > \beta^2/3 \geq 0 > \beta^2/3\). Then \(\beta^2/2 > \beta x > 5\beta^2/6\) which is a contradiction. So the case \(x \leq -2\) does not occur.

Case (2, \(x, y/2, z/6\)). Finally we return to the case \(r = 2\). Then \(G\) is a torsion-sheaf. Again \(0 \geq x > 2\beta\). So \(x^2 < 2\beta x < 4\beta^2\). From \(0 < \text{ch}_1^\alpha,\beta(F) < \text{ch}_2^\alpha,\beta(E)\) we have \(\beta x - 2\beta^2/3 < y/2 + 1 < \beta x\). The Bogomolov inequality for \(F\) gives \(x^2 \geq 2y\) and so \(y < \beta x\).

Case (2, \(0, y/2, z/6\)). Now we consider the special cases \(x = 0\) and \(x = -1\). First we let \(x = 0\). Then \(y < -2\) as \(\text{ch}_2(G) > 0\). But \(y\) must be even for \(G\) to be a sheaf and so \(y \leq -4\). Now \(z = 3\beta(2 + y)\) and so \(Q(F) = y(2 + y) + 2\beta^2(5y + 18)/3 < y(2 + y) - (1 + y/2)(5y + 18) = -3(y^2 + 8y - 12)/2\). This is negative for \(y \geq 10\). So \(y \geq -8\). Now \(\text{ch}(G) = (0, 0, a, \beta a)\) for \(a = 1, 2, 3\) and any integer \(\beta \leq -2\). Note that the classification of \(E\) in Proposition 8.2 shows that \(E\) is a quotient of a suitable sum of \(\mathcal{O}(-1)\). This is because \(|\mathcal{O}_X^1(1)\) is isomorphic to \(|\mathcal{O}(-1)^{\beta/2}/\mathcal{O}_X^2(1)\) by [29] (3) on p7] and the ideal sheaves are ideal sheaves of planar objects. Since \(G\) is semistable this constrains \(\beta \geq -2\) and so such \(G\) cannot be quotients of \(E\) in \(\text{Coh}(X)\). When \(\beta = -2\) we get the same wall because \(u \sim (1, 0, -1, 1)\).

Case (2, \(-1, y/2, z/6\)). Now we let \(x = -1\). Then \(-4 \leq y \leq 0\) from Lemma 8.10. Now \(-1 \leq \text{ch}_2(G) \leq 0\). But again there must be a non-zero map from \(\mathcal{O}(-1)\) and so \(\text{ch}_2(G) \geq -1/2\). Also \(2\text{ch}_2(G)\) must be odd and so the only possibility is \(\text{ch}_2(G) = -1/2\) and \(y = -1\). Then \(z = 3 + 3\beta + 2\beta^2\) and \(z \equiv 5 \pmod{6}\). Then \(Q(F) = 1 + 8\beta + 12\beta^2 + 4\beta^3\). This has a single root less than \(-\sqrt{3}\) given by \(\beta_0 \approx -2.11\). On the other hand, \(\beta\) must be a solution of \(2\beta^2 + 3\beta - 6n = 0\) for some integer \(n\). Solving this and tabulating values shows that the only possible solution with \(\beta \geq \beta_0\) is \(n = -1\) giving \(z = 5\). This is the third wall [60] listed in the Proposition.

Case (2, \(-2, y/2, z/6\)). Finally, we assume \(x \leq -2\). Then Lemma 8.10 implies \(-2x - 2 \leq y \leq -2x - 2\). But

\[
\frac{-1 - y/2}{-x} = \frac{\text{ch}_2(G)}{\text{ch}_1(G)} \geq -\frac{1}{2}
\]

as \(\text{Hom}(\mathcal{O}(-1), G) \neq 0\). This gives \(y \leq -2 - x\). Now from \(\text{ch}_3^\alpha,\beta(F) = 0\) we have \(z = 6\beta - 3x - 2\beta^2x + 3\beta y\) and so

\[
Q(F) = 12\beta^2 + \frac{10}{3}\beta^2x^2 + 2x^2 - 4\beta^3x - 12\beta x - 4\beta xy + y^2 + \frac{10}{3}\beta^2y + 2y.
\]

Then using \(2\beta x - 4\beta^2/3 - 2 < y \leq -2 - x\) and \(4 \leq x^2 < 2\beta x < 4\beta^2\) we have

\[
Q(F) < -(\beta x)^2 - 4\beta x - 4\beta^2/3 + 4x < 0
\]

and so this case does not arise.
Note that all four pseudo walls have $\beta = -2$. Also the wall for (57) and (58) coincide. For $s \geq 1/3$ the walls below $\Gamma_{v,a}$ are in the order $57 = 58 > 60 > 59$ and this is reversed above $\Gamma_{v,a}$ (see Figure 11).

We have now shown that the only walls which arise and which destabilize $\mu$-semistable torsion free sheaves are the ones listed in Proposition 8.11. But we still need to show that there are no further walls destabilizing new objects which can arise as we cross one of these walls. This is because on this wall and $E$ arising in (57) has a Jordan–Hölder cofiltration $E \to I_p \to O_L(-1) \to 0$. This happens for the non locally free null correlation sheaves. But non-trivial extensions of the form

$$0 \to I_p \to F \to I_L \to 0,$$

which do exist for all points $p$ and lines $L$, are unstable below this wall because there is an injection $\mathcal{I}_{L'} \to I_p$ in $\mathcal{A}^{\alpha, \beta}$ for any $L' \ni p$. On the other hand, if $E$ is a Gieseker semistable sheaf then there is a sequence of the form (58). For these, $\text{Ext}^1(O_L(-1), K) \neq 0$ and so there are $\lambda_{\alpha, \beta, s}$-stable objects given as (flipped) non-trivial extensions

$$0 \to O_L(-1) \to F \to K \to 0. \quad (61)$$

So below this biggest wall and above the next wall the only $\lambda$-stable objects are sheaves with torsion of the form $F$ above. These cannot appear in extensions of the form (60). Indeed, such extensions do exist and since such $E$ are locally-free Gieseker stable they must also occur in sequences of the form (58) and so either $S_p(1)$ or $I_{p/H}$ must be $\lambda_{\alpha, \beta, s}$-unstable at that point (in fact, it is $I_{p/H}$ which is unstable). This shows that the wall (60) is not an actual $\lambda$-wall. Finally, every object occurring as kernels or quotients of the four pseudo $\lambda$-walls admit a map from $O_{P^3}(-1)$ and so (59) is a vanishing wall. Above $\Gamma_{v,1/3}$ this is the largest wall and so it is the only actual $\lambda$-wall above $\Gamma_{v,1/3}$ and below $\Theta_v^-$.

So the only objects we need to finally consider occur as extensions of the form (61). Looking back at the cases considered we can see that we only use the fact that $E$ is torsion free is in the case $r = 1$ and $x = 0, 1$ and we use it to deduce that $y \equiv x \pmod{2}$. But we can see that $F$ also satisfies this as any torsion must have integral second Chern character. So we see that the arguments above still hold and there are no new pseudo $\lambda$-walls. \hfill $\Box$

**Remark 8.12.** Note that the problem of eliminating walls when $x \leq -2$ and $r = 1$ is actually a quadratic programming problem. To see this note that

$$z = -2\beta^2 x + 3\beta y + 3\beta - 3x$$

and so

$$Q(F) = 3\beta^2 + \frac{10}{3} \beta^2 x^2 + 2x^2 - 2\beta^3 x - 6\beta x - 4\beta xy + y^2 + \frac{5}{3} \beta^2 y + y,$$

which we can rewrite as

$$F_t(v) = v A_t v^T - cv^T$$

subject to the inequalities

$$4 \leq \gamma < \lambda/2 < \mu/4,$$

$$-2 - \gamma \leq y \leq \gamma,$$

$$\lambda - \frac{1}{3} \mu < \frac{y + 1}{2} < \lambda + \frac{1}{3} \mu,$$
where \( v = (\lambda, \mu, \gamma, y) = (\beta x, \beta^2, x^2, y) \) and

\[
A_t = \begin{pmatrix}
10(1-t)/3 & -1 & 0 & -2 \\
-1 & 0 & 5t/3 & 5/6 \\
0 & 5t/3 & 0 & 0 \\
-2 & 5/6 & 0 & 1
\end{pmatrix}
\]

and \( c = (6, -3, -2, -1) \). Then we need to show there is a real value of \( t \) for which \( F_t(v) < 0 \) given the constraints. In fact, numerical methods show that the "local" maximum value of \( F(v) \) when \( t = 1 \) is negative even without the additional non-linear constraint \( \gamma \mu = \lambda^2 \). But \( A_t \) is not definite and so this need not be a global maximum.

It follows from Theorem 6.16 that no other \( \lambda \)-walls in the region \( R_v^- \) exist, when \( s = 1/3 \). This observation allows us to give a complete chamber decomposition of this region, summarized in the following statement.

**Theorem 8.13.** Let \( Z \) denote the moduli space of Gieseker semistable sheaves \( K \) with Chern character \( (2, 0, -2, 2) \) and \( G \) the Grassmanian of lines \( L \) in \( \mathbb{P}^3 \). Let \( v = (2, 0, -1, 0) \) be the numerical Chern character corresponding to null correlation sheaves, and fix \( s = 1/3 \). The region \( R_v^- \) is divided into three stability chambers whose associated moduli spaces can be described as follows:

1. \( M_1 \cong \mathbb{P}^5 \), and the stable objects are null correlation sheaves;
2. \( M_2 \cong \{ (K, L) \in Z \times G | \operatorname{Ext}^1(K, \mathcal{O}_L(-1)) \neq 0 \} \), which is an irreducible projective variety of dimension 16, and the stable objects are extensions of \( K \) by \( \mathcal{O}_L(-1) \);
3. \( M_3 = \emptyset \).

The three stability chambers just described are pictured in Figure 11 as follows. The chamber (C1) lies above the purple and black curves (which corresponds to the walls (57) and (59), respectively); the chamber (C2) is located in the sector between the purple and the black curves below \( \Gamma_{v,1/3}^- \); finally, the vanishing chamber lies below the black curve. The green curve corresponds to the pseudo \( \lambda \)-wall (60).
As a final remark, we observe that Proposition 8.11 provide concrete examples of intersecting actual $\lambda$-walls for the Chern character $(2, 0, -1, 0)$.
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